THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXVI, No. 1 JANUARY, 1957

CONTENTS

The Liturgy, the Church, and Our Lord
Malachi J. Donnelly, S.J. 1

Catholics in Colonial America. Part I ..... *John Tracy Ellis* 11

Mary in Jeremias, 31:22 ..... *J. Edgar Bruns* 28

Public Opinion and the Professional Communicator
Raymond H. Potvin 32

The Semicentennial of the *Lamentabili* and the *Pascendi*
Joseph Clifford Fenton 42

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and Walter J. Schmitz, S.S.

The Use of Anaphrodisiacs 55

Evening Mass for Forty Hours' Devotion 56

The Precious Five-Dollar Bill 56

Relics of the Blessed Virgin 57

Distribution of Holy Communion 58

Tabernacle Door at Holy Communion Time 58

Master of Ceremonies at High Mass 59

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1957 by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Preceding Page*)

Vestment Material 59
Breviary Problem 60
Omitting Leonine Prayers 60
Minor Basilica 60
Altar Boy Problems 61

ANALECTA

Review of Recent Roman Documents
Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm. 63

BOOK REVIEWS

The Two-Edged Sword, *by John L. McKenzie, S.J.* 67
The Bridge. Vol. II, *Edited by John M. Oesterreicher* 68
Christ and the Sailor, *by Peter F. Anson* 72

CRAFTSMANSHIP
. . . in wood

Cathedral Craftsmen's pew bodies are completely factory assembled into continuous one piece units and represent the finest in church seating.

For illustrative folder write to

CATHEDRAL CRAFTSMEN
Dept. G, P. O. Box 286
WAUKESHA, WISCONSIN

"GLORIA"

● FINEST INCENSE

● SUPREME QUALITY

Famed for its composition and outstanding in its field
It is the incense which serves its purpose best

See your dealer

G. BOZYK MFG. CO.
426 E. 6th Street New York 9, N Y.

THE LITURGY, THE CHURCH, AND OUR LORD

Between the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ on this earth we can make no distinction. They are the same reality under every respect.[1] Hence, not unexpectedly does the Holy Father begin the Allocution which is the subject of these pages[2] by quoting from his own encyclical letter, *Mediator Dei:* "The Sacred Liturgy . . . constitutes the integral public worship of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, of the Head namely and of His members."[3]

THE LITURGY AND THE CHURCH

As we know, the Mystical Body is given life by its Head, Jesus Christ. Into this Body, and that largely through the ministry of the teaching Church, is poured forth abundantly the life of Christ's truth and His grace. And since life is a capability of self-movement, the Church goes forward, living the Christ-life shared, towards her final end, the triune God. Further, since the Church is one single, mystical organism, it gives to God through the liturgy and as a society the worship that is His due.

The hierarchy, or teaching Church, has at its disposal, the Holy Father tells us, two great resources, (1) the *depositum fidei* and (2) the *depositum gratiae.* Through the sacred liturgy the teaching Church impresses upon the laity, the taught Church, the seal of revealed doctrine derived from Sacred Scripture and Tradition, especially such doctrines as the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption. But, in Pope Pius XII's own words, one would have

[1] Cf. *Mystici Corporis, AAS,* XXXV (1943), 199; and *Humani Generis, AAS,* XLII (1950), 571. In both of these documents the Holy Father teaches that the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ on this earth are one and the same reality (*"unum idemque"* as in *Humani Generis, loc. cit.*).

[2] Allocution of September 22 addressed to all who had participated in the International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy just concluded in Assisi. I use the original French text published in *L'Osservatore Romano* of September 23.

[3] *AAS,* XXXIX (1947), 528-29; "Sacra Liturgia . . . integrum constituit publicum cultum Mystici Jesu Christi Corporis, Capitis nempe membrorumque eius."

difficulty finding a single truth of our Christian faith not expressed in some way in the liturgy.[4]

Furthermore, as the Holy Father adds, the solemn liturgical ceremonies are really a profession of faith in act, bringing home, as they do, to the faithful the fact of the love-relationship existing between them and the heavenly Father, a relationship resulting in the Incarnation of His Son and the redemption of sinful mankind by Christ's death on the Cross.[5]

Besides the ***depositum fidei,*** there is also the ***depositum gratiae.*** This is poured forth upon the faithful by the hierarchy and through the sacred liturgy. The sacrifice of the altar, the sacraments deriving their power from that one sacrifice, and the sacramentals—all part of the liturgy—cause an abundance of grace to flow out towards the members of Christ's Mystical Body.[6]

The liturgy, therefore, according to the Holy Father, has two purposes, one primary, one secondary. The principal end of the liturgy is the giving of social worship to God. The secondary purpose is the instruction and sanctification of the faithful; or, perhaps, I should rather say that the sanctification and instruction of the faithful through the liturgy are an implicit content, a necessary property of this public social worship.[7]

The role of the laity is not merely to allow the truth and grace of Christ to flow over them like oil. On the contrary, the laity

[4] Cf. *Documenta pontificia ad instaurationem liturgicam spectantia* (1903-1953). Collected and annotated by A. Bugnini (Rome: Bibliotheca "Ephemerides liturgicae," Edizione liturgiche, 1953), p. 70, n. 25: Liturgia, Didascalia Ecclesiae (Relatio audientiae privatae a Pio XI Patri B. Capelle, OSB, Montis Caesaris, Lovanii abbati, 12 dec. 1935): "La liturgie est une très grande chose. C'est le plus important organe du magistère ordinaire de l'Église."

[5] Cf. Encyclical Letter on the Sacred Heart, *Haurietis aquas, AAS,* XLVIII (1956), 309-53, esp. 320 ff.

[6] Cf. the words of Pope Pius XII to the people of France: "Le Christ agit dans les âmes par l'infusion de sa grâce plus encore que par ses enseignements, ses exhortations, ses promesses: surtout il est, par son Eucharistie, la source de la vie et de la sainteté." These words were spoken in the Holy Father's radio message on the occasion of the centenary of the Apostleship of Prayer (*AAS,* XXXVII [1945], 189).

[7] In this connection, the reader will find profitable the excellent article of Augustine Rock, O.P., "Liturgy, Theology, and the Church of God," *AER,* CXXVIII, 6 (June 1953), 426-37.

has a duty to lay hold on this truth and grace, to believe without reservation, to allow Christ's truth and grace to reform its life.

In this connection, the Holy Father also points out that the hierarchy and laity, in their respective contributions to the liturgy, are not like two separate things spliced together in mere juxtaposition. They more truly represent the working together of united members who are parts, vital indeed, of one and the same organism. As such, they should act as a single, living, mystical being; for it is precisely the hierarchy and laity which constitute the one single Mystical Body of Christ. And the Holy Father adds, because among the members of this one unique Body should reign perfect concord, a perfect unity of prayer, self-offering and self-sanctifying, one may truly say that the liturgy is the work of the whole Church.

The first part of the Allocution concludes with Pope Pius affirming again[8] that there is a real place for private worship in the Church and that this form of private worship will be as diverse as is the number of Christians. Not only does the Holy See tolerate, but it also recommends such worship, without, however, taking anything away from the preeminence of the liturgy itself.

THE LITURGY AND THE LORD

"Actio Christi." The Holy Father, while praising the efforts to have all the faithful participate in the liturgy of the Mass, which has as its goal the sensible expression of the mystery accomplished in the Eucharistic sacrifice, adds a word of warning. There is, he maintains, a danger of causing a lowering of respect, if one turns the attention from the principal action and directs it towards the outward display of other ceremonies.

The question is then asked: what is the principal action of the Eucharistic sacrifice? The Holy Father refers back to a previous Allocution of Nov. 2, 1954.[9] Then, after quoting the Council of

[8] In *Mystici Corporis, AAS,* XXXV (1943), 235-36 and *Mediator Dei, AAS,* XXXIX (1947), 560-61, 567 f., and especially 585-87, the Holy Father had insisted on the great value and efficacy of private prayer. Always, however, with nice balance, He safeguards the pre-eminence of liturgical prayer.

[9] *Magnificate Dominum, AAS,* XLVI (1954), 666-77, esp. 669. In this Allocution to the prelates who were assembled for the proclamation the day before of the new liturgical feast of Mary the Mother God, Queen of heaven and earth, the Holy Father first stated the doctrine of concelebration which he here repeats.

Trent,[10] he concludes: the priest celebrating and bearing the Person of Christ is the one who sacrifices and he alone. It is not the people, not the clerics, not even priests who piously and religiously are assisting the priest offering the Mass.

Pope Pius recalls that, in that same Allocution, he had stressed the following: certain ones drew a wrong conclusion because they did not distinguish between two different things (1) the question of the participation of the celebrant in the fruits of the Mass and (2) the other question of the nature of the action placed by the celebrant.

The false conclusion drawn was this: "The celebration of one Mass at which 100 priests assist with religious devotion is the same as 100 Masses offered by 100 priests."[11]

In the 1954 Allocution the Holy Father rejected this conclusion as *"opinionis error."* He added by way of explanation that the numerical multiplication of the actions of Christ the High Priest is based solely upon the number of priests celebrating, not at all upon the number of priests assisting at the Mass. By assisting at Mass they do not in any way bear and take on the Person of Christ sacrificing, but are to be compared to lay people assisting at the sacrifice.[12]

Liturgical Congresses, for a just and reasonable cause (*justa et rationabili causa*), may have the concelebration of pure ceremony, provided the error described above be avoided. This error is, namely, holding an equivalence between the celebration of 100 Masses by 100 priests and that of one Mass at which 100 priests piously assist.

At this point in the Allocution, the Holy Father instructs us in such wise that any lingering doubts about what really constitutes the essence of the Mass should be utterly done away with. The central element of the Eucharistic sacrifice takes place when Christ

[10] Cf. *Denz.*, 940.

[11] Allocution of Nov. 2, 1954, *AAS*, XLVI (1954), 668-70.

[12] Cf. the words of the 1954 Allocution: "Quoad sacrificii Eucharistici oblationem tot sunt actiones Christi Summi Sacerdotis, quot sunt sacerdotes celebrantes, minime vero quot sunt sacerdotes Missam episcopi aut sacri presbyteri celebrantis pie audientes; hi enim, cum sacro intersunt, nequaquam Christi sacrificantis personam sustinent et agunt, sed comparandi sunt christifidelibus laicis qui sacrificio adsunt" (*ibid.*, 669).

intervenes as *"se ipsum offerens,"*[13] that is to say in the consecration, in the act of transubstantiation effected by Christ.[14] At the consecration, in the very act of transubstantiation effected by the Lord, the priest celebrant is *"personam Christi gerens."* Even though the consecration is effected without any external solemnity and in simplicity, it is the central point of the whole liturgy of the sacrifice, the central point of the *"actio Christi cuius personam gerit sacerdos celebrans"* or the concelebrating priests *in a case of true concelebration* (the italics are Holy Father's).

The action of Christ Himself is accomplished, when the consecration of the bread and wine is validly effected. And even if all that ordinarily follows the consecration in the Mass could not be accomplished, nothing essential on that account would be lacking in the offering of the Lord.

After the consecration is finished, so the Holy Father tells us, then the *"oblatio hostiae super altare positae"* can be made and is made by the celebrating priest, by the Church, by the other priests, and by each of the faithful. But this action of theirs is not *"actio ipsius Christi per sacerdotem ipsius personam sustinentem et gerentem."*

In concelebration in the proper sense of the word, Christ makes use of several priests, instead of one. On the contrary, in the case of concelebration of pure ceremony when just one priest celebrates and many priests piously assist him (and this act of assistance could be performed by a lay person), there is not at all simultaneous concelebration.

The Holy Father then poses the question: "What intention and what external action are required in order that there truly be concelebration and simultaneous concelebration?"

Here he alludes to his Apostolic Constitution of Nov. 30, 1944.[15] In this document he taught that the two bishops accompanying the consecrator at an episcopal consecration must each have the intention of consecrating the elected person. Hence, they must place the action and pronounce the words through which the power and grace to transmit are signified and transmitted. It is not enough

[13] Cf. Council of Trent, Session XXII, ch. 2 (*Denz.*, 940).

[14] *Ibid.*, Session XIII, chs. 4 and 3 (*Denz.*, 877, 876).

[15] Apostolic Constitution, *Episcopalis consecrationis ministrum*, *AAS*, XXXVII (1945), 131-32.

that they unite their will with that of the principal consecrator and to declare that they make their own his words and his actions. They must themselves place the actions and pronounce the essential words.

The same holds good with respect to concelebration in the strict sense. Having and manifesting the will of making one's own the words and actions of the celebrant are not enough. Concelebrants must themselves pronounce the words of consecration over the bread and wine. Just as in the administration of the sacraments, one must place the external action and pronounce the words of the sacramental form with the intention *"saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia,"* so similarly, in the case of concelebration, one must see whether with the necessary interior intention the celebrant performs the external actions and, above all, whether he pronounces the words which constitute the *"actio Christi seipsum sacrificantis et offerentis."* That is not verified when the priest does not pronounce the words of concelebration over the bread and wine.

"Praesentia Christi." As the Holy Father indicates in this section of his Allocution, the Cross and consequent redemption of mankind dominated the life of Christ. In a similar manner, the altar and sacrifice are most prominent in the sacred liturgy. In some way, we are told, the Offerer is greater than the sacrifice. The Holy Father does not specify how and I do not intend here to speculate on this matter.

In the Eucharist, the Church possesses the whole Christ. His real presence is clearly taught by the Scriptures and defined by the Church. Hence, the matter is clear to Catholics. But, just how Christ is present in the Eucharist—that is a matter for theological speculation.

Regarding the work of theologians, especially in this important matter, the Holy Father lays down some salutary rules. First, theological speculation should take as its rule, unless weighty reasons urge the contrary, first, the literal sense of Scripture. Again, together with this literal sense of Scripture, the common faith and teaching of the Church take precedence over any scientific system. Science should adjust itself to revelation and not the opposite. Whenever a philosophic conception deforms the natural sense of a revealed truth, it is because this conception is not exact or because it is incorrectly used.

Pope Pius deplores the doctrine of certain modern theologians. True, they do accept the Council of Trent and the doctrine of Sacred Scripture concerning the real presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. But, in the words of the Holy Father, they reduce this presence to a kind of envelope emptied of its natural content.

This theory of explaining the real presence holds that the "essential and actual content of the species of bread and wine is 'the God in heaven' with which the species have a so-called real and essential relation of containing and of presence."[16]

Such a speculative interpretation is fraught with difficulties: it is hard to see how it can square with the words of the Council of Trent, the faith of the Church, and the very words of Our Lord. All of these demand that the Eucharist contain the Lord Himself. The sacramental species are not the Lord even if they do have with the substance of Christ in heaven a so-called essential relation of containing and of presence. The Lord has said: "This is my Body. This is my Blood."

Without doubt, He could have brought it about that the sensible signs of a real relation of presence would be sensible and efficacious signs of sacramental grace. But, there is here a question of the essential content of the Eucharistic Species, not of their sacramental efficacy.

The Holy Father maintains that such a theory is untenable, insufficient to justify one's saying truly about the Eucharist, *"Dominus est"* (cf. *John* 21:7). This theory would leave nothing in the tabernacle, but the species having a so-called real and essential relation with the true Lord who is in heaven, but not in the tabernacle.

The Tabernacle: some Observations. The Holy Father poses another question. Even as we say sometimes, "the Lord is in some way greater than the altar and the sacrifice," could one now

[16] Cf. *Humani Generis, AAS,* XLII (1950), 570-71. The *NCWC* translation, p. 12, par. 26 reads: "Some even say that the doctrine of transubstantiation, based on an antiquated philosophic notion of substance, should be so modified that the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist be reduced to a kind of symbolism, whereby the consecrated species would be merely efficacious signs of the spiritual presence of Christ and of His intimate union with the faithful members of His Mystical Body."

say, "The tabernacle, wherein the Lord dwells, having come down among His people, is superior to the altar and to the sacrifice?" The altar takes precedence over the tabernacle because we offer there the sacrifice of the Lord. The tabernacle possesses, of course, the *"Sacramentum permanens,"* but is not an *"altare permanens."* For the Lord offers Himself in sacrifice only upon the altar during the celebration of the Mass, but not after or outside the Mass. In the tabernacle He is present as long as the species remain, without nevertheless offering Himself permanently. One has the full right to distinguish between the offering of the Mass and the *"cultus latreuticus"* offered to the Man-god hidden in the Eucharist.[17]

There is, however, so the Supreme Pontiff tells us, need for stressing the unity, rather than the difference, between altar and tabernacle. It is one and the same Lord who is immolated on the altar and adored in the tabernacle. The Council of Trent and the Church in its ordinary *magisterium* has extolled very highly devotion to Christ in the Blessed Sacrament.[18]

We are told by our Holy Father that there is a tendency to esteem too little the action of Christ in the tabernacle. One remains content with the sacrifice of the altar and diminishes the importance of Him who accomplishes this sacrifice. But, the Person of the Lord should occupy the center of worship. For it is He who

[17] At this point in His Allocution, the Holy Father refers to a decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites for July 27, 1927. The Sacred Congregation, in answer to a two-fold *dubium,* replied that the practice was not allowed nor could it be tolerated of celebrating low or high Mass before the Blessed Sacrament veiled or exposed in a pyx, either inside or outside the tabernacle. The Sacred Congregation took this occasion to refer back to two of its former decrees, N. 3448 of May 11, 1878, and N. 4353 of April 17, 1919. These two decrees laid strictures on the *Missa coram Sanctissimo* and prohibited the distribution of Holy Communion from the altar of exposition, either during or outside Mass. The Holy Father clearly indicates in his present Allocution the reason for these decrees of the Sacred Congregation. The Sacrifice of the Mass is one thing and the Real Presence of Christ in the tabernacle is quite another distinct reality. And the Church wants these two realities kept perfectly distinct and unconfused in the minds of all the faithful.

[18] Sess. XIII, can. 6 (*Denz.,* 879); cf. *CJC,* can. 1262, § 2; can. 1269, § 2, § 4; *AAS,* XLIV (1952), 542-46. These documents show clearly the attitude of the Church towards Our Lord really present in our tabernacles.

unifies the relations of the altar and tabernacle and gives them their very meaning.

It is first by the sacrifice that the Lord becomes present in the Eucharist and He is only in the tabernacle as *"memoria sacrificii et passionis suae."* Separating the tabernacle from the altar is to separate two things which ought to remain united by their origin and their nature. The essential thing, with regard to the tabernacle, is not its place on the altar, but to have understood that it is the same Lord who is present on the altar and in the tabernacle.

The Holy Father then reminds us all how much the Church praises and recommends devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. Visits, forty hours, perpetual adoration, holy hour, solemn bringing of Communion to the sick, processions of the Blessed Sacrament—all of these are highly regarded by the Church. Hence, Pope Pius concludes, the most enthusiastic and convinced liturgist should realize what the Blessed Sacrament means for all Catholics, the simple and the educated alike. The liturgist should not be content to allow the faithful to come towards the Lord in the tabernacle, but should exert every effort to attract them there evermore.

"Infinita et divina maiestas." Before concluding his Allocution, the Holy Father speaks of the infinite and divine majesty of Jesus Christ. Christ is not only Man, but is in the Trinity as well. His divinity is the very reason and source of the latreutic worship offered to the Sacred Humanity

Hence, we are reminded, the divinity of Christ cannot remain on the periphery of liturgical thought. True, Christ is Mediator and it is the normal thing to go through Him to the Father. But He is not merely a Mediator. As One of the Trinity, He is equal to the Father and Holy Spirit in all things. Meditation, therefore, on the *"infinita summa divina maiestas"* of Christ can only contribute to a deeper understanding of the liturgy.

The Liturgy and History. In considering the liturgy and the past, the Holy Father points out two excessive attitudes. The first is blind attachment to things of the past, seemingly just because they are ancient. The second excessive attitude is a total disregard of the past. There are, we are told, in the liturgy immovable elements, things that transcend time and hold good for every epoch of history. On the other hand there are variable, transitory elements, which sometimes are even defective. The reconciliation of these two extremes by a *via media* is a goal at which to aim.

The Holy Father willingly admits that the liturgy influences the whole modern religious attitude, especially because of the greater participation in this liturgy on the part of the faithful. He sums up the attitude of the Church by declaring that she is solicitous for progress, but also maintains a conservative and vigilant attitude. She reveres the past, but does not cater to a slavish copying of it. This is evidenced in her using, at times, the vernacular language, in her allowing modern music, and approving modern church architecture.

In this connection, there is one point which the Holy Father stresses. He declares that the Holy See has serious motives for maintaining firmly in the Latin rite the unconditioned obligation for the celebrant priest to employ the Latin language. Furthermore, whenever Gregorian Chant accompanies the Mass, this must also be sung in Latin.

In concluding, Pope Pius XII says that the faithful are roughly divided into two camps: (1) the enthusiasts, whose excessively passionate enthusiasm at times has to be moderated by ecclesiastical intervention, and (2) those indifferent and even opposed to the liturgy. He is, so we are told, greatly interested in the diverse aspects of the contemporary liturgy. But, he also warns us, the Holy See must keep vigilantly alert, since it is its office to forestall anything that could be a source of error and danger.

To one who reads this Allocution, of which I have given a summary here, it should be clear that it is one of the finest yet given by our present Holy Father. It is steeped in doctrinal content and throughout is pervaded by that balance and catholic outlook that is so characteristic of the Catholic Church, Christ's Mystical Body on earth.

MALACHI J. DONNELLY, S.J.

St. Mary's College
St. Marys, Kansas

CATHOLICS IN COLONIAL AMERICA

PART I

"Columbus's conversation with the friar at La Rábida is the starting point of modern history. The past had ruled the world till then—what began that day was the reign of the future."[1] Thus did Lord Acton characterize the fateful change of plans brought about by the Italian navigator's visit to the former confessor of Queen Isabella. For it was Fray Juan Pérez who convinced Columbus that he should await the results of another approach to the Spanish sovereigns before he would turn to France. The general motives which lay behind Columbus' persistence in trying to reach the Indies by sea are too well known to bear repetition here. But it is important to remember that among the objectives which he outlined in the first entry in his journal was to establish contact with the native princes and people so as to observe what he termed "the manner in which may be undertaken their conversion to our Holy Faith . . ."[2]

That the religious motive should have occupied a leading place among the considerations which led to the historic voyage of 1492, will occasion no surprise to those who are acquainted with the intense zeal for the Catholic faith that attended the final expulsion of the Mohammedans from Granada in January of that year. For centuries an intermittent warfare had been waged in the peninsula, and Columbus' personal faith, deep and sincere as it was, was further kindled by his residence in Spain, a land as yet relatively untouched by the revival of pagan influences that had so seriously dimmed religious enthusiasm among the leaders of his native Italy. Yet on the first and most famous voyage there were no priests to bless the landing of Columbus and his men when they set foot for the first time in October, 1492, on the soil of the new world.[3] It was only on the second voyage that the familiar pattern

[1] Acton Papers, Add. 4902, University of Cambridge Library, G. E. Fasnacht to the writer, Oxford, Aug. 20, 1954.

[2] Samuel Eliot Morison, *Admiral of the Ocean Sea. A Life of Christopher Columbus* (Boston, 1942), I, 204. After quoting the original entry Morison says, "So begins the most detailed, the most interesting and the most entrancing sea journal of any voyage in history" (I, 205).

[3] Concerning the first voyage Morison remarks, "Certain pious souls, worried by the absence of a priest, have tried to invent one" (*ibid.*, I, 193).

of close association of ecclesiastics with the seamen and colonizers of Spain was begun. When the second expedition sailed in September, 1493, it was accompanied by Bernardo Buil, O.S.B., Ramón Pane, a Jeronymite friar, and three Franciscans. The instruction of Ferdinand and Isabella had directed that the prime object of the undertaking was to be the conversion of the natives, who were to be treated with every consideration, and the complete equipment furnished to Buil and his companions for setting up the first church had been supplied through the gift of the queen. Thus on the feast of the Epiphany, Jan. 6, 1494, in a temporary church erected at Isabela, the tiny settlement on the island of Hispaniola, all hands attended the first Mass at this scene of the first European colony in the new world.

This inauguration of the missionary effort of the Catholic Church in behalf of the American natives brought no quick response. Buil proved to be a troublesome and discontented fellow who quarrelled with Columbus, and not long after he returned to Spain filled with complaints against the great navigator. It was Pane, a more modest and tractable priest, who accomplished the baptism of the first Indian convert in Hispaniola in September, 1496, and with this the Church's long, and often painful, history among the native peoples was begun.[4]

The interest manifested by the Holy See in these events from the very outset marked no new departure. From the days when John of Piano di Carpine and John of Montecorvino inaugurated the Franciscan missions in China in the thirteenth century there had been repeated efforts on the part of the Church to carry the gospel to the peoples of the Orient. Evangelization followed close in the wake of exploration, and by the middle of the fourteenth century there was already a bishopric in the Canary Islands and missionaries were tracking the Portuguese navigators and explorers as they made their way slowly down the west coast of Africa. Columbus' voyages, therefore, merely gave new life to an old resolve to Christianize what was still thought to be a part of the oriental world. As a consequence of this policy, when the dispute of John II of Portugal and the sovereigns of Spain was referred to him for arbitration, the shrewd Alexander VI had more in mind in issuing his line of demarcation in May, 1493, than the settlement

[4] *Ibid.*, II, 166.

of a quarrel, for even that very worldly pontiff was not entirely devoid of interest in the promotion of the Catholic faith.

The bull of Alexander VI provided, it is true, sanction for the dual empires of Spain and Portugal in the western hemisphere, but more pertinent to our purpose was the bull of his successor, Julius II, which in July, 1508, set the form for future development of the relations between Church and State in the American dominions of Spain, a form which was to endure until that empire was finally extinguished in the revolutionary uprisings of the nineteenth century. Ten years before America's discovery Pope Sixtus IV, deeply embroiled in the wars of the Italian states and in need of the good will of the Spanish rulers, yielded to the pressure of Ferdinand and Isabella by granting to them extensive concurrent rights over episcopal nominations within their domains. Having won the right of patronage at home, it was to be expected that after they had acquired an overseas empire the Spanish kings should seek the same privileges abroad. Alexander VI, himself a Spaniard, found a decade after Sixtus IV that he was even more dangerously involved in the politics of the Italian peninsula. Thus in 1493 he granted to the Spanish crown the right to name all the missionaries who should go to the new world, and in 1501 he conceded to them all the ecclesiastical tithes in Spain's American possessions to be used for building and support of churches in the colonies. But the most sweeping and significant of the papal grants of ecclesiastical power to the kings of Spain was that of Julius II who on July 28, 1508, issued the bull *Universalis ecclesiae* by which he commanded that no church, monastery, or religious house should be built in the colonies without the royal assent having first been obtained. Moreover, the *real patronato,* or the right of the rulers to nominate to all ecclesiastical benefices without exception and in perpetuity, was made over to them. At that time the dignities and property holdings of the Church in the West Indies were, of course, insignificant, but the action of Julius II took on enormous importance after the Spanish conquests on the mainlands of North and South America.

Thus by the time that the first serious attempts were made to plant a Spanish colony in what is today the United States the control which the crown had gained over the Church and its activities was virtually complete. For example, in June, 1523, Charles V

issued a patent to Lucas Vasquez de Ayllón for the settlement of Florida, and in it he declared that the conversion of the Indians was "the chief motive you are to bear and hold in this affair, and to this end it is proper that religious persons should accompany you. . . ."[5] Ayllón's choice fell upon several Dominican friars, among whom was Antonio Montesino whose principal claim to fame is that he was the first to denounce publicly the Spaniards' enslavement of the Indians. In this ill-fated expedition of 1526 to Florida, as in all subsequent ventures in Florida, the Southwest, and on the Pacific coast the missionaries were chosen by the civil authorities and remained subject to the latter for the support of their assignments.

In the course of the ceaseless activity of the Spanish navigators and explorers in the first half of the sixteenth century they suffered many a setback at the hands of their French and English rivals, from attacks by the Indians, and from the hazards of nature encountered in the vast, unknown, and difficult terrain which they sought to conquer. But by the middle of the century the principal obstacles had been overcome in the Caribbean and Central America, and the proud Aztec empire of Mexico had been reduced to subjection. Slowly but surely the Spaniards drew a tremendous arc around the southern limits of the present United States, an arc which stretched from the Atlantic coasts of Georgia and Florida on the east to the region beyond the Golden Gate on the west. It represented no sudden and stable conquest, this borderland encirclement, since three centuries intervened between the futile attempt of Juan Ponce de León to settle Florida in 1521 and the opening of the final Franciscan mission at San Francisco Solano in northern California in July, 1823. Nonetheless, Spain maintained its rule in most of those regions through the greater part of that time, and on virtually every major expedition, whether it sailed direct from the mother country or the Caribbean, or whether it came overland from the Viceroyalty of New Spain, Catholic priests were an important element of the enterprise.

Subject as they were to civil masters by reason of the *real patronato,* and of necessity often dependent upon the protection of the military, the missionaries yet managed in time to establish a

[5] John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886), I, 105.

distinct regime. The fiery denunciations of Bartolomé de las Casas, the Dominican friar, over the Spanish colonial officials' enslavement of the natives, ultimately won a hearing in Spain, as did similar protests which several of his fellow Dominicans lodged with the Holy See. As a result Pope Paul III issued a bull on June 2, 1537, in which he declared that

> . . . the said Indians and all other people who may later be discovered by Christians, are by no means to be deprived of their liberty or the possession of their property, even though they be outside the faith of Jesus Christ; and that they may and should, freely and legitimately, enjoy their liberty and the possession of their property; nor should they be in any way enslaved; should the contrary happen, it shall be null and of no effect.[6]

Five years later the agitation of Las Casas and his confrères led to the promulgation of the so-called New Laws for the governing of the natives by the Council of the Indies. It is true that the opposition to these regulations of both Church and State was so fierce, and the difficulties of enforcement so real, that they were robbed of much of their value. But the fact remains that as time went on the authority of the crown became stronger on the imperial frontiers of America, and as it did so the worst abuses against the natives were gradually eliminated. It was then that the missionaries came to assume in place of the *encomenderos* an increasingly prominent role in the task of subduing and controlling the Indians.

In the numerous expeditions that heralded the advance of Christian civilization into the Spanish borderlands of this country, many different groups of priests participated. When Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, for example, landed in 1565 to expel the French from the south Atlantic coast, it was secular priests who accompanied him and who established in August of that year the first Catholic parish within the borders of the United States at St. Augustine, Florida. It was not, however, the diocesan priest-

[6] Francis Augustus MacNutt, *Bartholomew de Las Casas* (New York, 1909), p. 429. The full text of the *Sublimis Deus* of Paul III is given here in English translation (pp. 426-31). Speaking of Charles V's success in getting a nullification of this papal bull for his dominions, Lewis Hanke has stated that, nonetheless, it "lived on as a force to be reckoned with in the endless disputes over the true nature of the American Indians because the nullification was not widely known." "Pope Paul III and the American Indians," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXX (April 1937), 97.

hood that undertook the evangelization of the Florida Indians. In that work the religious orders played the leading role. The Dominicans, Jesuits, and Franciscans, in turn, had their day in trying to win the Florida natives to the faith. But it was an uphill struggle for all of them, and after the Society of Jesus had been on the scene for six years with only severe losses in personnel and relatively few converts to show for their pains, St. Francis Borgia, the General of the Jesuits, withdrew his men to send them to the more promising mission fields of Mexico. As he told Menéndez, "They have worked and suffered in Florida with a constancy that has been manifest, and yet they have seen little or no fruit of their labors, which is the greatest suffering of all for those who seek only the good of souls for the greater glory of God."[7]

But the Florida missions were not allowed to lapse, for the Jesuits had hardly departed before the sons of St. Francis appeared in 1573 to inaugurate a term of service that lasted for nearly two centuries. In addition to the hardships which were common to all missionary efforts among the American Indians, the Franciscans in Florida had to contend with an enemy that was too distant ever to disturb their confrères in the American Southwest. As the English settlements multiplied along the coasts of Carolina and Georgia the mission stations among the Apalachee became the victims of constant raids from their northern neighbors. By the early eighteenth century many of the more than forty missions, which in 1634 had embraced around 30,000 Indian converts under the direction of some thirty friars, had been laid in ruins. Seven Fran-

[7] Borgia to Menéndez, Rome, March 20, 1571, Felix Zubillaga, S.J. (Ed.), *Monumenta antiquae Floridae (1566-1572)* (Rome, 1946), p. 489. In these years the Jesuit missionaries sought Indian converts as far north as Virginia. Cf. Clifford M. Lewis, S.J., and Albert J. Loomie, S.J., *The Spanish Jesuit Mission in Virginia, 1570-1572* (Chapel Hill, 1953). In view of the fact that the entire venture would seem to have been doomed from the outset, the letter which Father Luis de Quirós sent from Ajacán on Sept. 12, 1570, to a friendly Spanish official in Havana, was especially pathetic. He said, "I am convinced that there will be no lack of opportunity to exercise patience, and to succeed we must suffer much. But it has seemed good to expose ourselves to that risk and this especially so, since in your kindness you might be able to send us a generous quantity of corn to sustain us and to let all this tribe take some for sowing" (p. 90). Five months later all five Jesuits and their lay catechists were murdered through the treachery of a Christian Indian guide.

ciscans who had sought refuge in St. Augustine signed a report to King Philip V of Spain in May, 1707, in which they included an impressive list of the Florida martyrs of their order since the mid-sixteenth century.[8] Yet in spite of the fact that the cause was in good measure doomed by the growing strength of the English, the treachery of their Indian allies, and the decline of Spain, the friars continued on. But after Colonel John Palmer and his Georgia raiders in March, 1728, plundered the venerable shrine of Nuestra Señora de la Leche in the Indian town of Nombre de Dios—where the first Mass had been celebrated on Sept. 8, 1565—the missions of southern Georgia and northern Florida were gradually abandoned. In the words of a recent historian, "The vestiges of a once populous Guale declined in the eighteenth century like the going down of the sun."[9]

In another area of the future United States the pattern of missionary expansion had much in common with the principal features of that in Florida. Yet in general the establishments of the Church in the future States of Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and California were destined to endure longer and to accomplish more than the missions of the Southeast. In the Southwest, too, the missionary marched alongside the explorer as, for example, when Fray Marcos de Niza and Fray Juan de Padilla accompanied Coronado on his epochal journey across the plains in 1541 in search of the Gran Quivira. After the principal party had turned south Padilla remained behind with several companions in the hope of finding converts among the Indian tribes. But they were soon struck down by the savages and somewhere on the plains of Kansas in the summer of 1542 Padilla became the country's proto-martyr.

It was a somber beginning but the young and zealous recruits from the missionary colleges of Mexico were in no way daunted, and as the Spanish military cleared the way the Franciscans pushed on in spite of the frequent Indian massacres of their brethren. When Don Juan de Oñate took formal possession of New Mexico in the name of God and Spain in the spring of 1598 nine friars under the leadership of Fray Alonso Martinez were with him to witness the

[8] Mark F. Boyd, Hale G. Smith, and John W. Griffin, *Here They Once Stood. The Tragic End of the Apalachee Missions* (Gainesville, 1951). The letter is printed on pp. 85-89.

[9] John Tate Lanning, *The Spanish Missions of Georgia* (Chapel Hill, 1935), p. 235.

event and to assist at the dedication of the little church at San Juan, the first Spanish town in New Mexico, on the following September 8. With the founding of Santa Fé in 1609, two years after the English reached Jamestown, the capital was transferred to that historic town. It was from San Juan that Fray Alonso's brethren first fanned out in all directions in their efforts to Christianize the Indians of the neighborhood. As the missions grew in number and strength more friars were enlisted for the work, and in 1630 Fray Alonso Benavides, who had arrived eight years before as the new superior with twenty-seven additional men, could report to the government at Madrid that around 80,000 New Mexican Indians had by that time been baptized, of whom some 35,000 were then living in ninety pueblos grouped around twenty-five missions. Four years later in a revised report to Pope Urban VIII the same superior described in detail the life led in these missionary settlements in which he included mention of how the missionaries cared for the poor. Benavides stated:

> For the support of all the poor of the pueblo, the friar makes them sow some grain and raise some cattle, because if he left it to their discretion, they would not do anything. Therefore the friar requires them to do so and trains them so well, that, with the meat, he feeds all the poor and pays the various workmen who come to build the churches. With the wool he clothes all the poor, and the friar himself also gets his clothing and food from this source. All the wheels of this clock must be kept in good order by the friar, without neglecting any detail, otherwise all would be totally lost. . . .[10]

But the high promise that the New Mexican missions showed throughout most of the seventeenth century proved to be illusory. Beneath the surface of the Indians' Christian practices the pagan superstitions persisted and the medicine men were far more effective in their secret counseling than the friars realized. The opposition to the Spaniards and everything associated with them steadily gained momentum and it finally struck with annihilating force in August, 1680, when the whole of the Pueblo country suddenly rose in rebellion. Within a few weeks the accomplishments of

[10] Frederick Webb Hodge, George P. Hammond, and Agapito Rey (Eds.), *Fray Alonso de Benavides' Revised Memorial of 1634* . . . (Albuquerque, 1945), p. 103. Benavides' report of 1630 has recently been issued in a new translation and edition, Peter P. Forrestal, C.S.C. (Trans.), Cyprian Lynch, O.F.M. (Ed.), *Benavides' Memorial of 1630* (Washington, 1954).

almost a century had been wiped out, and in the frightful carnage that ensued twenty-two Franciscan priests were murdered, the missions sacked, and the Spanish settlers massacred, taken captive, or forced to flee. It is true that by 1700 New Mexico had largely been reconquered, but the missions never again knew the prosperity they had seen in the days before the great rebellion. Moreover, jurisdictional quarrels between the friars and the diocesan officials of the See of Durango, which had been erected in 1620 and made to embrace New Mexico, further weakened the cause. Bishops like Benito Crespo, who was strongly biased against the Franciscans, reported the latter's failure to learn the Indian dialects on his visitation of the missions in 1730. And thirty years later Pedro Tamarón y Romeral, Bishop of Durango, spoke similarly after his visitation of 1760 when he found thirty friars still stationed in New Mexico. The problem of admitting Indian converts to the sacraments was an especially vexacious one to Tamarón, and reflecting his censure of the friars for not learning the Indian tongues in order to instruct their converts properly he said:

> This point saddened and upset me more in that kingdom than in any other, and I felt scruples about confirming adults. I remonstrated vehemently with the Father Custos and the missionaries, who tried to excuse themselves by claiming that they could not learn those languages.[11]

Yet the very years that witnessed the New Mexico missions of the Franciscans enter a decline saw their confrères from the famous missionary colleges at Querétaro and Zacatecas in Mexico launch their far-flung enterprises in what is today Texas. The rising ambitions of France in the lower Mississippi Valley—evidenced by the Joliet-Marquette expedition of 1673 and La Salle's landing on the Texas coast in 1684—alerted the Spaniards to the danger of further French encroachments. The friars took advantage

[11] Crespo's strictures on the friars were incorporated in two letters which he wrote to the viceroy, one from Bernalillo on September 8, a second from El Paso on Sept. 25, 1730. Cf. "Documents Concerning Bishop Crespo's Visitation, 1730," *New Mexico Historical Review,* XXVIII (July 1953), 222-23. The Tamarón statement is in the edition of Eleanor B. Adams, "Bishop Tamarón's Visitation of New Mexico, 1760," *New Mexico Historical Review,* XXVIII (July 1953), 207. The visitation record was printed serially here beginning with the issue of April, 1953.

of this fact, and it was Father Juan Larios who was the leading spirit in the Church's original undertaking and who sang the first high Mass on Texas soil in May, 1675. At that time he refused to comply with the Indians' desire to be baptized until they had first been given instructions. As Larios' companion said, "when they were given to understand by him through an interpreter that he could not baptize them until they knew their prayers, to console them he baptized fifty-five infants, the Spaniards acting as their godfathers."[12] The hostility of tribes like the Asinai, and the great distance from their base of operations, proved too great an obstacle on the first attempt and in 1693 the missionaries withdrew from Texas. But within a decade they were back again as the Spanish authorities set on foot more systematic measures for the conquest of Texas and the expulsion of the French from western Louisiana. It was in 1716 that there came on the Texas scene the renowned Fray Antonio Margil as superior of the missions, a friar who was to suffer many reverses during the next few years from the French, the Spanish Governor of Texas, Martín de Alarcón, and the fickle neophytes. But by the time he left Texas in 1722 Margil had laid the foundations for a number of new missions, among them one which was later called the finest in New Spain, namely, San José near to San Antonio, a town which the Spaniards had founded in 1718.

And as the Franciscans advanced into Texas their efforts were duplicated in the same years by the Jesuits in what would one day be Arizona. There in Pimería Alta, as southern Arizona was then called, the most remarkable personality was Eusebio Kino, a Tyrol-born Jesuit and a graduate of the University of Ingolstadt, whose versatility of knowledge entitled him to be described as "in the fullest sense a pioneer of civilization."[13] Kino was not only a priest whose principal concern was winning the Indians to the Catholic faith, but he was also a significant cartographer, an historian of importance, and a mathematician. His knowledge of stock breeding and farming was responsible for the introduction of ranching into five or six of the river valleys of southern Arizona and,

[12] Herbert Eugene Bolton (Ed.), "Diary of Fernando del Bosque, 1675," *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest, 1542-1706* (New York, 1916), p. 301.

[13] Herbert Eugene Bolton, *The Rim of Christendom* (New York, 1936), p. 592.

too, for the Christian Indians of that area learning how to irrigate and to till the soil in the best methods of that day. Founder of numerous missions, he personally baptized over 4,000 Indians besides making more than fifty exploratory inland journeys varying from 100 to 1,000 miles in length from his mission of Nuestra Señora de los Dolores which was his base of operations for nearly a quarter of a century.

It was in late April, 1700, that Kino arrived at San Xavier del Bac, the most famous of his Arizona foundations. He quickly despatched messengers to the chiefs of all the surrounding tribes and invited them to meet him, and on April 28 the Indians of the village began the construction under his supervision of the large mission church. At intervals during the day he catechized the natives, and after the arrival of the distant chiefs during the nights, as Kino remarked, "we had long talks, in the first place in regard to our holy faith, and in regard to the peace, and quietude, and love, and happiness of Christians, and they promised, as we requested of them, to carry these good news and teachings to other rancherías and nations much farther on . . ."[14] For several days this routine continued until on May 2 he departed for Mission Dolores with the ground well laid for a mission which is still in use today in the fertile Santa Cruz Valley nine miles south of Tucson. It was Kino's hope that he might return as the permanent missionary at San Xavier del Bac, and in anticipation of its fulfillment he had rounded up 1,400 head of cattle which he sent north under an overseer with instructions that a portion of them should go to his neophytes at Del Bac. The Jesuit superior had given his consent for Kino's transfer, but as the great missionary said, "never did a father come to succeed me in Nuestra Señora de los Dolores, nor could I go permanently to San Xavier del Bac."[15] Kino ended his days on March 15, 1711, at Magdalena, another of the Pimería Alta missions that he had founded. It was this man who earned the description of being "the most picturesque missionary pioneer of all North America—explorer, cartographer, mission builder, ranchman, cattle king, and defender of the frontier."[16]

[14] Herbert Eugene Bolton (Trans. and Ed.), *Kino's Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta. . . . 1683-1711* (Cleveland, 1919), I, 237.

[15] *Ibid.*, I, 241.

[16] Bolton, *Rim of Christendom,* p. vii.

During the last years of Kino's life his Jesuit confrères far to the south and west of his beloved Pimería Alta were grappling with an exceedingly difficult assignment in trying to bring the Catholic faith to the natives of Lower California. In the seventy years between their establishment of the mission of Nuestra Señora de Loreto in 1697 and their summary expulsion from all the dominions of Spain by the decree of King Charles III in 1767, they managed to erect seventeen missions in the peninsula. Moreover, the explorations in the 1740's along the Gulf of Lower California and through the Gila and Colorado River Valleys of Jesuits like Keller, Jakob Sedelmayr, and Fernando Consag quickened the interest of Spanish colonials generally in the vast areas to the north, and they definitely determined Cristóbal Escobar, the Jesuit provincial, to have his men push on into the Moqui country and Alta California. But Charles III's decree cut short all these plans and in February, 1768, the fifteen priests and one lay brother were expelled from Lower California, and the Jesuit missions were given over to the Franciscans who arrived in April, fifteen in number and led by a friar destined for the most famous of all missionary careers in Alta California, Junípero Serra.[17]

It was for reasons of state policy that within a year of their coming to Lower California the plans of Serra and his brethren were shifted to the north. For some time Spain had been viewing with increased anxiety the activity of English, French, and Dutch ships along the Pacific coast. When it became clear, therefore, that Russia had serious notions of following up the voyages of Vitus Bering down the same coast, the decision was taken to move upon Alta California as the only way of insuring the security of Spain's imperial interests. Thus when the first contingents of the Spanish forces left the south early in 1769 friars were in the company,

[17] The Jesuit missions of Lower California were finally transferred to the Dominicans by an agreement with the Franciscans signed on April 7, 1772, which permitted the latter to devote their entire energies to Alta California. Cf. Herbert Eugene Bolton (Ed.), *Historical Memoirs of New California by Fray Francisco Palóu, O.F.M.* (Berkeley, 1926), I, 236-40, for the text. Speaking of the expulsion of the Jesuits by Spain, Alastair Cooke remarked, "There were absolutely no grounds, of politics or common decency, for recalling them from the Spanish colonies. But, as often happened before and since, history was having one of its obscene and incurable brainstorms." *One Man's America* (New York, 1952), p. 232.

and on July 1 of that year Serra arrived at San Diego with the land expedition of Governor Gaspar de Portolá. The missionary was then fifty-six years of age and had already been in the new world for twenty years. In 1749 he had resigned his chair as professor of philosophy in the University of Palma to devote the remainder of his life to the American missions. On July 16, 1769, Serra founded at San Diego the first of a chain of nine missions which he was to see established during his term as superior, and after his death in 1784 his spirit lingered over the founding of the twelve additional missions erected in the days of the presidency of his successors, Francisco Palóu and Fermín Francisco de Lasuén.

Of all the enterprises of the Franciscan Order in the future United States their missions in California were, perhaps, the most far reaching and effective, as they certainly were the most colorful. In California, better than anywhere else, one gets a clear picture of the true contribution of the friars to the taming of the American savages in the twenty-one missions that eventually stretched from San Diego on the south to San Francisco Solano north of the Golden Gate, and in which 146 sons of St. Francis devoted all or a portion of their lives between 1769 and 1845. In all these colonial missions—and there were at one time as many in Texas as in California, more than that number in Florida, and twice California's twenty-one in New Mexico—the Franciscans, the Jesuits in Arizona, and the other priests were not alone ministers of religion. They were agents of the Spanish crown as well, and as such they supported the policies of the government whenever those policies did not run counter to the principal business of the missionaries in saving souls. For example, when Spain declared war on Great Britain in June, 1779, the news was long in reaching California, but when Serra learned of it he despatched a circular letter to all the missions on June 15, 1780, in which he informed the friars of what had happened, reminded them of the generosity of Charles III's government to their missions, and emphasized the interest which they should take in the matter. There was nothing that the Franciscans in California could do to hasten Spain's victory over England but to pray, and with that in mind Serra said, "of each and every one of Your Reverences I most earnestly ask in the Lord that as soon as you receive this letter you be most

attentive in begging God to grant success to our arms."[18] Little did the American rebels on the Atlantic Coast realize that over 3,000 miles to the west a Spanish friar was ordering prayers to be said for the defeat of their common enemy!

As an important part of the colonizing methods of Spain in the new world the numerous missionary establishments of the Church were, as has been said, closely linked with the civil and military administration. The missionaries were, then, in every sense agents of both Church and State, for it was from the State that they received—if often irregularly—their annual stipends. It was likewise the State that furnished troops from neighboring presidios for the protection of the missions and, too, the civil government usually paid an initial grant of $1,000 for equipping the mission with items such as bells, sacred vessels and vestments for divine service, and tools for the workshops. But the priests more than earned the support they were given by their disciplining and civilizing of the native peoples. It was the missionaries who taught the Indians the rudiments of learning in the mission schools, instructed the women how to cook, sew, spin, and weave, and the men how to plant the crops, to fell the forests and to build, to tan leather, to run the forge, to make ditches, to shear the sheep, and to tend the cattle. It was they who introduced to these distant frontiers almost every conceivable domestic plant and animal then known to Europe and who taught the savages how to make the best possible use of them for their own profit and enjoyment. Wherever the native people could be subdued and subjected for a time to the mellowing influences of a stabilized and Christian life the outstanding values of the system were manifest. For example, at the time of the secularization of the California missions in 1834 over 30,000 peaceful and productive Indians were living at the twenty-one missions which counted a grand total of 396,000 head of cattle, 321,000 hogs, sheep and goats, and 62,000 horses. The mission farms were then yielding over 120,000 bushels of grain with corresponding results from the orchards, gardens, wine presses, looms, shops, and forges which the missionaries had taught the Indians to grow and to use.

[18] Circular letter of Junípero Serra to the California missions, San Carlos, June 15, 1780, in possession of the Academy of American Franciscan History.

No one who is acquainted with the history of the Church in the Spanish areas of colonial America will deny that there were at times defects and abuses. For the frightful injustices visited upon the Indians in the early years in places like the West Indies and Central America—the enslavement was never practiced to the same degree in the lands which later became the United States—the Church was, however, in no way to blame. In fact, the enslaved natives had no more vehement and persistent defenders of their rights than the missionaries, and it was due to them, more than to any other single group, that the official and sympathetic policies of the crown toward the native inhabitants ultimately replaced the earlier harshness. One of the chief sources for the defects in the Church's system of rule was the *real patronato,* a set of privileges which had been conceded to the Spanish kings by the Holy See almost a century before the establishment of the first lasting mission in the future United States. Out of the State's patronage of ecclesiastical affairs there arose endless disputes between the two authorities which, in turn, led to serious division in the Spanish settlements and to a general weakening of colonial government. The scandal given to the Indians by these quarrels was real, for they often found themselves the bewildered victims of contests between the civil and military on the one hand and the missionaries on the other. As a consequence there ensued a demoralizing effect on the natives and a lessened respect for the Catholic faith which they had been asked to embrace. The differences arose at many points where the jurisdictional lines between Church and State were dim, and in one form or another they existed throughout the entire colonial period. For example, the military often tried to win the natives for their selfish purposes by plying them with liquor, a practice which the missionaries fought vigorously, as they likewise resisted the civil officials' attempts from time to time to profit by Indian labor. Thus the friction, as one writer has said, revolved around issues such as "rivalry for control of the destiny of the Indians, problems of mission discipline, the conflict of economic interests, the question of ecclesiastical immunity, the authority of the custodian as ecclesiastical judge ordinary, the

proper exercise of ecclesiastical censures, and interference of the clergy in strictly secular matters."[19]

Yet when due allowance has been made for the defects in the system under which the Church operated in the Spanish borderlands, as well as for such personal failings here and there as the neglect of certain missionaries to learn the native dialects, to give sufficient instruction in Catholic doctrine, and to fulfill in all particulars the demands of their exacting calling, the over-all accomplishment still remained an impressive one. The place names of towns, rivers, and mountains of the Far West and Southwest—to say nothing of the many Spanish place names that were later changed—are reminders of the richness they bequeathed to the American heritage, a fact which is further emphasized by the architectural designs of those regions. The historians of colonial English America would search in vain for parallels to university-trained men like Kino and Serra who abandoned highly civilized surroundings to devote their lives to lifting a savage people to a higher state. As the greatest historian of the Jesuit and Franciscan missions has said, these institutions "were a force which made for the preservation of the Indians, as opposed to their destruction, so characteristic of the Anglo-American frontier."[20]

No one of the great missionary orders of colonial America, it is true, ever fully realized its hopes for the American redmen. But that fact should not blind us to the contribution which they made in bringing the light of the gospel to thousands of minds darkened by idolatry, and the arts of civilized living to these crude and nomadic savages. Were it not for these men we would possess far less scientific knowledge than we do on the languages, social customs, and religious practices of the aborigines, for it was the missionaries, more than anyone else, who preserved the Indian lore in their grammars, memoirs, histories, and artifacts. It was they, too, who played a major role, by their inculcation of the culture and religion of old Spain, in forging one of the strongest links that we have today with our sister republics of Latin

[19] France V. Scholes, *Church and State in New Mexico, 1610-1650* (Albuquerque, 1937), p. 192. Cf. also John Francis Bannon, *History of the Americas* (New York, 1952), I, 367 ff.

[20] Herbert Eugene Bolton, "The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish American Colonies," *American Historical Review,* XXIII (October 1917), 61.

America.[21] The ancient *leyenda negra,* that for so long a time colored English and American historiography on all things Spanish, has now lost much of its force in intellectual circles by reason of honest and objective research, and most enlightened Americans are prepared to accept, even more than they would a quarter century ago, the words of Herbert Ingram Priestly when he said in 1929, "It is of prime significance for the life of America today that the first white men to settle on these western shores were Spaniards and Roman Catholics, representatives of a powerful nation that was the citadel of a united faith."[22]

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

(To be continued.)

The Catholic University of America

[21] Bolton's presidential address before the American Historical Association at Toronto in December, 1932, "The Epic of Greater America," *American Historical Review,* XXXVIII (April 1933), 448-474.

[22] Herbert Ingram Priestley, *The Coming of the White Man, 1492-1848* (New York, 1929), p. 1.

MARY IN JEREMIAS 31:22

All Catholic students and theologians must ever have a desire to renew their familiarity with the great privileges of our Lady and with her place in the economy of Redemption. To attain this end, the Scriptures must be searched anew, that those texts which speak of her be not forgotten or relegated to the rank of fanciful accommodation.

For centuries the words of Jeremias the prophet: "for the Lord hath created a new thing upon the earth: a woman shall compass a man,"[1] have been understood to refer to the Virgin Birth, yet this Mariological interpretation was practically abandoned with the advent of what we might call nineteenth century *desupernaturalization*. So true is this that in recent times only *one* Catholic exegete has defended the Marian sense of this verse.[2] Most Catholic exegetes, while admitting that between Isaias and Jeremias there is a "perfect continuity of Messianic thought,"[3] prefer to adopt one of the many far-fetched explanations or emendations of the Hebrew text proposed by non-Catholic scholars of a generation or more ago.

Of course we must not blind ourselves to the fact that the text in question has suffered from skeptical treatment as a result of the very different variant readings of it which exist. As someone has pointed out, in the Septuagint rendering of this famous verse, only six words in all seem to bear any relation to the Hebrew,[4] and there are also translations by Theodotion and Aquila which incorporate modifications of their own. Yet no modern exegete seems to have made as the basis of an attempted understanding of our text that accepted norm of textual criticism which affirms that *a correction which explains the origin and development of the variant readings is likely to be the authentic one,* especially

[1] *Jer.* 31:22.

[2] W. Lauck: *Das Buch Jeremias* (Freiburg-in-Breisgau: Herder, 1938), p. 222. The able and interesting defense by Closen, followed by Roschini in his Mariology, is a special study not to be found in an exegetical commentary on Jeremias; cf. *Verbum Domini,* 1936.

[3] J. Steinmann: *Le Prophète Jérémie* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1952), p. 208.

[4] N. H. Snaith: *Notes on the Hebrew text of Jeremiah* (Epworth Press, 1945), p. 29.

if the correction is based on a paleographical emendation.[5] The present article is the result of an experiment which adopted that norm as the starting point of its investigation.

To begin with, we must suppose that the original text of Jeremias 31:22 as it left the hands of the prophet, or of Baruch, was, or became illegible enough to give rise to a variety of orthographic confusions. From these misreadings of the text arose our present-day variants. How this illegibility came about is a matter of speculation, but it is not difficult to imagine circumstances in keeping with what we know of the history of Jeremias to account for the phenomenon.[6]

The words: "for the Lord hath created a new thing upon the earth: a woman shall compass a man," are those of the Hebrew, Massoretic text. The Greek, or Septuagint text reads quite differently: "for the Lord hath created salvation for a new planting; man will walk about in salvation." For the first part of the verse Aquila has: "the Lord hath created something new in a woman,"[7] but Theodotion, except for the omission of "for a new planting," agrees with the Septuagint. These are the chief variants for which we seek to posit a hypothetical primitive text.

The alphabet used by Jeremias and subsequent copyists of his work—perhaps as late as the third century B.C.[8]—was Phoenecian, not the square, Aramaic type so familiar to us today. In this Phoenecian script if the letters were slightly illegible, the word for "woman" might easily be confused with that for "planting." They look alike when written in this alphabet. Now only the Septuagint has "planting," whereas both the Massoretic text and Aquila read

[5] Cf. J. Coppens: *La critique du texte Hébreu de l'Ancien Testament*, 2nd ed. (Bruges: Desclée), pp. 41-43. Cf. also *Institutiones biblicae*, 6th ed. (Rome: Pont. Inst. Biblicum, 1951), I, iii, no. 150.

[6] A badly burned parchment might well account for the subsequent difficulties. The writings of Jeremias were consigned to the flames once as we know from *Jer.* 36; yet there were always men eager to save the prophet's writings from destruction, cf. 36:25. The exact date of composition of c. 31 is unknown, but at no time of his real activity was Jeremias free of enemy obstruction.

[7] This is the reading of Aquila given by Olympiodorus and Saint Athanasius. Origen's *Hexapla* gives a reading of Aquila in complete accordance with the Massoretic text. The fact is that Aquila edited two editions of his interpretations (cf. Höpfl: *Introductio generalis in S. Scripturam*, 5th ed., 1950, n. 403).

[8] Cf. Coppens, *op cit.*, p. 43.

"woman." This leads us to suspect that "woman" is primitive and "planting" not.

Again, the word for "salvation" appears in both the Septuagint and Theodotion but is lacking in the Massoretic text and Aquila. At the same time *all* the variants contain the word "new." The similarity in Phoenecian script between "salvation" and "new," if we suppose a simple metathesis, is too striking not to have accounted for the subsequent omission of *salvation* in some texts by haplography. This then gives us as the original reading of the first part of our verse: "for the Lord hath created a new salvation in a woman."[9] What about the Massoretic text's addition of "upon the earth"? Since it stands alone in the list of variants, we can conceive of it being a gloss introduced into the text. It would represent a later consultation of the reading which found expression in the Septuagint with its "for a new planting." The Hebrew scribe noted in the margin that others place this "new salvation" not in a woman, but on the earth. When this "upon the earth" was introduced into the text, the displacement of "woman" led to the present reading of the Massoretic text.

The second part of the verse (*Jer.* 31 : 22) probably read, originally, "and it will encompass mankind," referring, of course, to the new salvation. The word for "encompass" is found in all the variants—"walk about" is the same word in a different usage—and must, therefore, be retained. Since the Greek translations had misread "woman" as "planting" and since the Hebrew text had displaced "woman" from its original position in the verse, the sense of "and it will encompass mankind" was lost, and the present readings, which are but a modification of the primitive word forms, were introduced in order to clarify and justify the corrupt readings of the first half of the verse.

This experiment has been presented without making use of the Hebrew words in their Phoenecian dress in order that those without a specialized knowledge of Semitic languages could understand the reasons for the restored text here suggested.[10] That the

[9] Approaching very closely to the reading of Aquila.

[10] A list of the more common possible confusions between letters of the Phoenecian alphabet is given in *Inst. Biblicae, op. cit., ibid.*, nn. 10-12. The table of alphabets in A. Reifenberg's *Ancient Hebrew Seals* (London, 1950) will prove very interesting to the curious reader who might like to carry out the experiment for himself.

results of this experiment cannot be adjudged more than hypothetical or suggestive, is taken for granted. What *has* been proved is that there are still untried ways and means of defending the Mariological interpretation of this celebrated text.

J. Edgar Bruns

St. Joseph's Seminary
Dunwoodie, Yonkers, N. Y.

Fifty Years Ago

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for January, 1907, from the pen of Fr. John Fryar of Ramsgate, England, is entitled "The Old English New Year." The writer recounts in detail the quaint customs in vogue in England and Scotland several centuries ago, to see the old year out and the new year in. The practice of presenting gifts, we are told, is the oldest of all the old English customs. "Dr. Drake is of the opinion that Queen Elizabeth's jewellery case and wardrobe were maintained principally by these annual contributions." . . . Bishop Stang, of Fall River, contributes an article on Fr. Henry Denifle, O.P., the celebrated author of *Luther und Lutherthum,* who died in June, 1905, in Munich, while on his way to receive an honorary doctorate from the University of Cambridge. . . . Another chapter of the anonymous novel "A Clerical Story of Sixes and Sevens," with the subject of ecclesiastical music as its chief theme, appears in this issue. . . . Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P., discusses the authorship of the "Ancren Riwle," an Anglo-Saxon treatise on the religious life, dating from the thirteenth century. He believes that the author was Fr. Robert Bacon, O.P., who died in 1248. . . . A writer calling himself "Fra Arminio," in an article entitled "The Life of Christ in the Modern Priest," urges priests to imitate the virtues of Our Lord, particularly His charity. . . . A contributor to the "Studies and Conferences" notes that Pope Pius X, since his election to the papacy, has said nothing to indicate that he intends to maintain the claim to temporal power. The writer believes that "the temporal power is regarded by the present Pontiff, not as a thing to be fought for, but rather as a principle to be maintained.". . . Fr. Francis X. Reuss, C.SS.R., contributes a Latin poem in honor of the Divine Infant. . . . An answer to a question on the right of Catholics to join the Y.M.C.A. gives a rather indefinite solution to the problem.

F. J. C.

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATOR

In his address to the International Convention of the Catholic Press on Feb. 18, 1950, Pope Pius XII stressed the importance of an informed public opinion in modern society.[1] Nevertheless at the very same time he warned against " 'making' opinion" and ascribed to his hearers the prime responsibility to "serve it."[2] This would seem, at first glance, to be a sweeping condemnation of the professional communicator or public relations counsel and those who would imitate their function in society. It is true that this profession has most often been equated with the unsavory techniques of the unscrupulous publicity agent who has but one avowed purpose, namely, to sell something or someone to an unsuspecting public whether it be for their good or their harm. Perhaps the professional communicator is not completely innocent of the imputations implied in such an identification, but the fact remains that the demands of modern society have created a specific role for the professional communicator in the formation of public opinion, and this role with the techniques associated with it are subject to control by the laws of morality and the common good of society as implied in this allocution of Pius XII.

Though the Pope insisted that public opinion be not "made," he did not specify that it had to be formed in a vacuum. In fact he calls upon enlightened leaders to influence its formation and to act as "solid walls on which the voice of . . . events strikes and resounds with spontaneous echo."[3] This distinction is more than important, and in the hope of understanding its many ramifications, it becomes necessary to pay close attention to the very nature of public opinion and its formation in a complex society.

Fr. Felix Morlion has defined public opinion as "the collective mind of men living in modern society."[4] Subsequent development of his thought dispels any doubt that he subscribed to a "group

[1] *AAS,* XLII (1950), 251.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 255.
[3] *Ibid.,* p. 252.
[4] Felix Morlion, *The Apostolate of Public Opinion* (Montreal: Fides, 1944), p. 59.

mind theory" of society, but his words indicate clearly that public opinion is not a mere sum of individual attitudes but an integration of opinions. This so-called organization results from interaction. People disagree about the solution of a common problem, they attempt to persuade each other, and from their discussions stems a decision or a pattern of decisions. Thus there exists the "generalized judgment of a considerable number of people on a particular aspect of social life" and the process itself by which it was achieved.[5] In other words, public opinion is something more than the unrelated opinion of a majority. A. Lawrence Lowell gives the following example:

> The court, therefore, in holding a statute unconstitutional, is in effect deciding that it is not within the range of acts to which the whole people have given their consent; so that while opinion in favor of the act may be an opinion of the majority of voters, it is not a public opinion of the community, because it is not one where the people as a whole are united in a conviction that the views of the majority, at least as expressed through the ordinary channels, ought to prevail.[6]

More specifically some sociologists restrict the term public opinion to the pattern itself of pros and cons at any given time of the decision-reaching process. In either case it is the fruit of interaction, a factor of considerable importance in our own society. In a democracy it is not only imperative that public opinion be expressed freely, but it must be formed freely and thus is intimately bound up with the democratic process of public discussion.

Some of its beginnings then may be traced to the small informal group. In fact, conversation is the most common mechanism by which opinions develop and are spread. The casual conversational group, table group talk, the gossiping group, the whispering campaign, all are quite significant because they involve to a high degree value-judgments, feelings and emotions. Moreover, these groups are personality-centered, and in truth people can move other people much better than anything else.[7] Unfortunately there

[5] Emory Bogardus, *The Making of Public Opinion* (New York: Association Press, 1951), p. 3.

[6] A. Lawrence Lowell, "Public Opinion and Majority Government," *Public Opinion and Propaganda,* ed. by Katz et al. (New York: The Dryden Press, 1954), p. 12.

[7] Bogardus, *op. cit.,* pp. 31-42.

exists here a fundamental weakness in the development of reliable public opinion in that democratic discussion is not always based upon objective and verifiable data. The theoretical solution, of course, is to make such data available to the public through the mass media of communication, but for many reasons this is far from being easily realizable.

These modes of communication have arisen because urban living has made it extremely difficult for people to communicate with each other, an essential prerequisite to all forms of public behavior. Large concentration of population and physical distance have restricted the possibility of face-to-face discussion. Social distance resulting from differences in occupation, wealth, education, and power has reduced the common ground for a meeting of minds and has made discussion more difficult to conduct. Thus the newspapers, the radio, television, and motion pictures not only furnish materials for discussion but have become an indirect means of communication between people.

Unfortunately the mass media of communication do not fulfill either of these roles adequately. The very high costs of setting these up in operation result in the centralization of outlets and those who control the media are in a position to control the dissemination of information and issues. It is also true that in some measure all news or opinions can not be sifted or arranged in a highly arbitrary manner since the mass media of communications not only influence public opinion but reflect it as well. Nevertheless this implies that individuals with a message must have a substantial popular following to have access to these facilities and such a following can be obtained in general only through these very facilities. The dilemma is obvious. Then again, in as much as the mass media of communication stress the new, the emotional and the oversimplification of issues, they in effect represent a distorted picture of reality and of society.[8] It is easy to overgeneralize the problems but they are sufficiently widespread to negate much of the benefits usually assumed.

Another important consideration to be made is the fact that people who are already convinced on an issue expose themselves to

[8] Charles H. Cooley, *Social Disorganization* (New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1909), p. 84 and Emory Bogardus, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-95.

that outlet of a particular medium which reflects their own views. To the others they pay little or no attention. Thus incipient patterns of opinion are set and hardened but rarely changed.[9] It is inevitable then that the very demands of a dynamic public opinion necessitate the rise of a special profession, namely, leaders who will condition the people to use the mass media of communication and in turn manipulate this media to guarantee the diffusion of vital information.

Such men have become known as professional communicators or public relations counsels. Because of their familiarity with the mass media of communication they are a vital tool of adjustment within society and are in a position to integrate individuals and groups. With the increasing differentiation of social functions due to population growth and technological progress, there has arisen great diversity of interest. Moreover the various institutions of our society have developed at an uneven rate. The professional communicator is in a position to facilitate communication between these various institutions, groups, or publics, and thus facilitate adjustment.

This is particularly important in a democracy which depends upon an alert and informed public opinion making permanent demands for justice and provisional demands for policies consistent with the first.[10] Since the function of government in a democracy is not always exercised absolutely by the institution of government "there is a vital two-way connection between government and public opinion. . . . Democratic government acts upon public opinion and public opinion acts openly and continually upon government. The open interplay of opinion and policy is the distinguishing mark of popular rule."[11] There is need then for professional communicators to put over governmental policy just as there is need for them to present the ideas of various groups to policy-makers. Congressmen are not basically in a position to accomplish this function since they are elected on a geographical basis and technology has changed the importance of

[9] Helen M. Hughes and Shirley A. Star, "Report of an Educational Campaign," *American Journal of Sociology,* LV, 389-400.

[10] Harold Lasswell, *Democracy Through Public Opinion* (George Banta Publishing Co., 1941), p. 16.

[11] *Ibid.,* p. 15.

geography. More important today and needing representation are the industrial, trade, agricultural, professional, and wage-earning interests. It is not surprising then that pressure groups grew up with the country.[12] Effective democracy is a complicated business and it is indeed difficult to conceive of a two-way connection between government and public opinion without the professional communicator.

There are many matters moreover on which the public lacks either the knowledge or the experience to reach decisions and thus Harold Lasswell insists that sound public opinion "must follow the advice of wise leaders."[13] The complexities of modern society as well as a certain inertia of the masses make it relatively impossible for the public to decide basic issues without effective guidance. This is explicitly recognized by Pope Pius XII who insists that "even under the best external and internal conditions for its development and expansion, public opinion is neither necessarily infallible nor always wholly spontaneous."[14] Naturally, because of the nature of his address he stresses the role of the press in remedying the situation, but he does mention as well the need for leaders "to whom the role of enlightening and guiding public opinion should fall."[15] These leaders in turn can only be effective if two-way communication exists with the public. Because of the deficiencies in the functioning of the mass media and because of the very nature of society, it is again difficult to conceive how this can be accomplished without the professional communicator who not only enlightens but must persuade as well if the leader is to guide.

The professional communicator or public relations counsel provides the knowledge and techniques which make it possible for the leader to be effective, because leadership in a democracy depends upon understanding the public and knowing how to influence it. In glowing words Lasswell characterizes this particular function:

[12] Stuart Chase, *Democracy Under Pressure* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1945), pp. 9-10.

[13] Lasswell, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

[14] *AAS*, XLII (1950), 254.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

> The public relations specialist advises the maker of influential decisions. His point of view is that of the policy maker, and in practice he is the "other ego" of the policy determiner. He is at once the roving critic, the soaring imagination, and the sympathetic observer of responsible authority . . .[16]

All in all—it is to be expected that the practitioners of this profession will not only give out information to the public but will also attempt to persuade, in an effort to integrate attitudes and actions of an institution or a leader with its publics and of publics with that institution or leader. In fact, J. A. Pimlott insists that "the social significance of the public relations group arises . . . less from its contribution to public information and education than from its persuasive aspect."[17] Without subscribing completely to such a categorical statement, the serious student of society must admit that the professional communicator as a propagandist fulfills a necessary role. Moreover, the line of demarcation between information and persuasion is not always clear, hence it is extremely difficult to admit the former function without the latter.

The end result is that whether propaganda is equated with all persuasive activities or restricted to those on controversial issues, as a general rule, professional communicators or public relations counsels often act as propagandists. It is in this sense that they are particularly useful to society while at the same time being a potential threat. Oftentimes the techniques of the profession will be used for an unworthy cause or to white-wash evildoers. People can be manipulated and fooled in the interests of a minority. A government propaganda machine can be the instrument of a dictatorship.[18] Many times, in fact ninety-five per cent of the time when acting for business concerns, professional communicators pretend to be no more than glorified press agents.[19] In summary, the ideal is not being realized with consequent disastrous results for society.

This is precisely the point Pius XII had in mind in his address when he condemned the "making" of public opinion. He deplores the "abuse of power by gigantic mass organizations which seize

[16] Lasswell, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

[17] J. A. R. Pimlott, *Public Relations and American Democracy* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951), pp. 240-41.

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 85, 199-213.

[19] "Business Is Still in Trouble," *Fortune*, May, 1949.

modern man in their complicated mechanism, strangling in its stride all spontaneity of public opinion and reducing it to a blind conformity of thought and judgment." He specifically opposes "astute propaganda which arrogates to itself the privilege of shaping public opinion to its whim." But this, in no way, is a condemnation of all propaganda in the sense of persuasion. It is a condemnation of abuse and of evil techniques which create an ersatz public opinion.

On this very point the Reverend Francis J. Connell writes:

> True, propaganda can consist of the representation of facts, without any element of falsehood, though in a manner calculated to win the assent or approval of the hearers or readers. With this type of propaganda we take no issue; for in itself it is a perfectly lawful means of persuading people to follow a certain course of action.[20]

It is on such a principle that Father Morlion bases his recommendations for an apostolate of public opinion. The *Pro Deo* Movement has developed techniques that appeal to the emotions and wield popular themes in view of spreading higher inspiration. Thus ideas are given a greater dynamism and force which help to move the will of the masses.

In fact propaganda is a major stage in the public opinion process. Free discussion presupposes free propaganda as long as basic rules of morality are observed. Moreover, by the very nature of things, any person or organization depending upon public approval is faced with the need of engineering public consent for support of a program or goal. Here again there can never be toleration of falsehood or indoctrination in the sense that a system of beliefs is presented in such a way that they are accepted uncritically. It must also be remembered that the engineering of consent can never replace the educational system, but by the same token education can not replace completely the engineering of consent since in practice that ideal can never be completely realized. Thus Bernays insists:

> Even in a society of a perfectionist educational standard, equal progress would not be achieved in every field. There would always be

---

[20] Francis J. Connell, *Morals in Politics and Professions* (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1946), p. 101.

time lags, blind spots, and points of weakness; and the engineering of consent would still be essential.[21]

Though education is the soundest basis possible for a dynamic public opinion and the professional communicator is one of the necessary tools for the dissemination of information, the engineering of consent is also necessary and the same professional communicator is the persuasive tool of society's leaders. As representing the various groups of the community he assumes the role of an advocate and operates upon the public as a whole much as the lawyer performs before the judge and jury in the interests of justice.[22] No profession poses more ethical problems, but if its practitioners are guided by the rules of morality as advocates, they can contribute to social harmony by assuring individuals and groups that their views are being presented to the public.

Harwood L. Childs comments quite rightly that "the basic problem of public relations is to adjust such relations to the broader aspect of social change in a way that will promote the public interest."[23] This can be extremely difficult since in practice the professional communicator is hired by a client to represent his interests, but the profession is actually taking cognizance of the problem and the more responsible of the practitioners advocate that:

> In his clients' interest, the public relations man needs the strength of character and integrity to say "no" to a client who insists on a policy that may be injurious to him. A public relations man must tell his client not what he wants to hear, but what is sound, what will accomplish his social objectives.
>
> In his own interest, the public relations man must maintain his reputation and that of his profession. . . . He must reflect his integrity and character equally to the public and to the media of communication that reflect and affect public opinion. Unless he maintains such a code, he is lost from every standpoint. Truthfulness is an indispensable quality both for advancement and for serving the media of communication.

---

[21] Edward L. Bernays, *Public Relations* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1952), p. 160.

[22] Lasswell, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76.

[23] Harwood L. Childs, *An Introduction to Public Opinion* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940), p. 22.

> The public relations man must avoid the temptation to do anything that might harm the public. The profession would be more highly respected if practitioners gave up clients who asked them to act in a way inconsistent with the public interest . . .[24]

Of course this insistence that the professional communicator be a man of character and integrity is precisely what will ensure his fulfilling adequately his role in the formation of public opinion.

This role is a necessary one. The very nature of public opinion and its pattern which results from interaction and discussion demands the disseminator of information and the propagandist. The complexity of society has given rise to mass media of communication but the masses have to be conditioned to use these facilities in a rational manner and not expose themselves only to what they wish to hear. The media themselves must be made available to those with a message. The increasing differentiation of social functions has given rise to a great diversity of interest among groups and individuals. People easily misunderstand each other as a consequence and there is need for someone to keep the channels of communication open, thus facilitating adjustment. The very nature of democracy demands two-way communication between the government and public opinion. Policy must be understood by the people and they in turn should be able to influence policy-makers. Moreover, it is absolutely required that sound public opinion on complex issues follow the advice and guidance of wise leaders. These men must know the public and in turn must be able to reach the public even though it be widely scattered. In summary, it is the professional communicator who provides the knowledge and the techniques to make this interaction possible.

The professional communicator or public relations counsel fulfills his role by furnishing needed information and acting as an advocate or propagandist for the various leaders or segments of society. Unfortunately he has often abused this latter function, using his knowledge and techniques to indoctrinate and "make" public opinion for the benefit of the few to the detriment of society as a whole. This is what Pius XII condemns and not the function itself. Though public opinion is based primarily upon sound education, propaganda and the engineering of consent remain a real

[24] Bernays, *op. cit.*, pp. 128-29.

and practical necessity. The professional communicator is bound by the same rules of morality as is the lawyer and his activities are limited necessarily by the common good of society. But inspired by the ideals of his profession, as a man of character and integrity, the practitioner in guaranteeing the dissemination of information and the forceful presentation of views guarantees as much as is humanly possible an informed and effective public opinion.

RAYMOND H. POTVIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE SEMICENTENNIAL OF THE *LAMENTABILI* AND THE *PASCENDI*

The year 1907 will always have a prominent place in ecclesiastical history because it saw the issuance of the first two of the three basic anti-Modernist documents. The Holy Office decree *Lamentabili sane exitu* was dated July 3, 1907, and it was first published in the columns of *Osservatore Romano* two weeks after that day. The encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis* bears the date Sept. 8, 1907, and it first appeared in print in the September 16 number of the *Osservatore*. The third of these key statements against the Modernist heresy appeared three years later. It was the *Motu proprio* entitled *Sacrorum antistitum*, issued by St. Pius X on Sept. 1, 1910.

Quite probably, during the course of this fiftieth anniversary year, there will be a great deal of very serious study of and writing about these documents, the teaching they contain, and the heresy against which they were directed. To the extent that they are accurate and objective, such studies and writings will be intensely interesting to and profitable for students of sacred theology and of recent theological history throughout the world. The Catholic scholars of our own country in particular would be aided immeasurably by the publication of new studies giving a theologically and historically correct description of Modernism and the Catholic polemic against the Modernist errors, and explaining the genesis and the subsequent development of the Modernist movement.

There are two reasons why new writings on the subject of Modernism are definitely needed, especially here in the United States of America. The first is based on the relatively small amount of available published material dealing with this heresy and with the Catholic fight against it. The second reason is founded on the lack of theological and historical accuracy in a great part of the published writings readily accessible to us. Far too many of the books and articles dealing with Modernism and the Modernist controversy are so thoroughly slanted in favor of the Modernists and their sympathizers that the person who adopts the attitude of the writers and accepts their judgments will inevitably acquire twisted and erroneous notions about the controversy and the people who took part in it.

At the moment we do not have in English any genuinely satisfactory book about Modernism and the Modernist controversy. The only fairly recent full sized volume dealing with this matter is a Protestant work, Alec Vidler's *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church.*[1] There is a lack of theological competence manifest in this book, but in spite of this it is still a fairly useful reference source, particularly for the chronology of Modernism.

What, despite rather serious shortcomings, is still the best monograph on the subject, Msgr. Jean Rivière's *Le modernisme dans l'église,* was published in 1929, a decade before the appearance of Loisy's *Memoires.*[2] No English translation of Rivière's work has ever been published, and, especially since a rather considerable body of material, unavailable in 1929, has been published since that time, it would not by any means be an unmixed blessing to have such a translation made now. There is not, and there has not been, any work in English on the subject of Modernism which ever attained even the level of *Le modernisme dans l'église.*

As a matter of fact, readers of English literature have had to derive most of their knowledge of Modernism and its history from biographies of men who were more or less involved in the movement itself, and from studies which touched only obliquely and incidentally on the subject. Unfortunately, both in such biographies and in books and articles dealing only indirectly with Modernism, contemporary readers can find seriously misleading accounts of the Modernist controversy.

[1] *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church: Its Origins and Outcome* was published at Cambridge, England, at the University Press, in 1934. It is a book of 286 pages. The work was the Norrisian Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge for the year 1933.

[2] *Le modernisme dans l'église: Étude d'histoire religieuse contemporaine* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1929, xxix + 589 pp.) offers the best available bibliography on the subject. Nevertheless, it is strange that some works of major importance which were available to Msgr. Rivière are not listed by him. Oddly enough, he does not list Fr. Emmanuel Barbier's *Histoire du catholicisme libéral et du catholicisme social en France du Concile du Vatican à l'avénement de S. S. Benoit XV (1870-1914),* despite the fact that he mentions earlier anti-Modernist writings by the same author, and lists the review *Critique du libéralisme religieux, politique et social* of which Barbier was the editor and the principal contributor. Barbier's *Histoire,* a work in five volumes with a separate index, is indispensable for any serious study of the Modernist movement in France.

In great measure the weakness of the available biographical literature dealing with the subject of Modernism stems from the fact that much of this writing has been highly colored by the various authors' sympathies for the Modernists and for their cause. Thus, for example, *The Life of Baron von Hügel,* by Michael de la Bedoyere, a book published in 1951 and readily accessible to any reader of the English language, is not only a biography of but an apology for the old Modernist leader and agitator.[3] Von Hügel is both the subject and the hero of the book. His thought and conduct is always represented as good. The people who were friendly with him and who agreed with him are represented favorably. The men who opposed his teachings and disapproved of his conduct are either passed over or depicted as thoroughly unsympathetic characters.

A good indication of the slanting process employed in this book can be gained from an examination of the titles the author has given to some of the parts and the chapters of the work. The section dealing with the years 1893-1914 is entitled "The Terrible Years."[4] The chapter dealing with the period 1906-08 is called "The Climax of the Tragedy."[5] In the context, the period was "terrible" and tragic, not because the teaching which God had revealed through His Son was being opposed and contradicted by members of His Church, but because serious doctrinal errors which Von Hügel and his friends tried to represent as advanced religious scholarship were attacked and condemned during those years. The unwary reader is led to believe that the tragedy was found in the triumph of Catholic dogma, rather than in the teaching by Catholics of doctrines incompatible with Catholic dogma.

Less flagrantly colored than the account of Modernism in De la Bedoyere's work but still quite unsatisfactory from the points of view of theology and history is the description of the same movement in *Insurrection versus Resurrection,* the second volume of Maisie Ward's *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition.*[6] In this

[3] This book was published in London by J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., the publishers of Von Hügel's own writings.

[4] *Ibid.,* pp. 67-276.

[5] *Ibid.,* pp. 181-211.

[6] This second volume of *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition* was published in New York by Sheed and Ward in 1937. It runs to xi + 588 pages. It is a mine of information about the Modernist movement, in that it makes

case the hero worship of the author for the subject of the biography is understandable, but that hero worship has made the treatment of Modernism in the book definitely misleading. Indeed, the central thesis of the book might well be summed up in the statement that Father Knew Best, even in the field of Catholic dogma. And, since Wilfrid Ward himself was personally friendly toward, or at least sympathetic with, the leaders of Modernism, and seems to have heartily disliked their Catholic opponents, *Insurrection versus Resurrection* tends to represent the Modernists themselves as profound scholars who were carried away by adventurous conclusions, to depict the sympathizers with Modernism as fine Catholics who were distressed by the activities of St. Pius X and his helpers, and to portray the more prominent opponents of the Modernists, men like Monsignor Benigni, as the villains of the piece.

That same tendency has been plainly manifest in several recent writings that have touched only indirectly on the subject of Modernism. In his well known *Essor ou declin de l'église,* the late Cardinal Suhard described Modernism and integralism as two tendencies which Catholic writers of our time are called upon to avoid.[7] His strictures against integralism, however, are far more extensive and severe than those he levels against Modernism it-

---

available otherwise inaccessible letters bringing out the attitudes and reactions of Modernists and their allies. Unfortunately the author gives credence to what she calls "Fontaine's collection of documents concerning the history of the *Action Française,*" apparently unaware that "Fontaine" was in reality the anti-Catholic Canet, who later wrote against Pope Benedict XV, and that his "documents" were in reality nothing more than a selection from the highly elusive sources brought to the attention of the public in 1921 in the anonymous and ill-famed *Memoire sur la Sapinière.* Thus *Insurrection versus Resurrection* bases its vicious charges against Monsignor Benigni, to use the expression which Fr. Raymond Dulac has employed with reference to a French publication guilty of a similar offense, on *"un auteur pseudonyme, utilisant un écrit anonyme, qui s'appuie sur les documents introuvables"* (Cf. *La pensée catholique,* n. 23 [1952], p. 89).

[7] This work, the text of which constituted Cardinal Suhard's Lenten pastoral letter of 1947, was published in Paris by Les Éditions du Vitrail. It is a pamphlet of 71 pages. An English translation was published here in the United States by the Fides Publishers of South Bend, Ind., under the title *Growth or Decline? The Church Today?* Cf. Fenton, "Two Currents in Contemporary Catholic Thought," in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXIX, 4 (Oct., 1948), 293-301.

self.[8] Fr. Yves Congar's *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église* gives what purports to be a description of the opposing attitudes of *les catholiques intégristes* and *les catholiques ouverts*. The comparison makes it quite evident that the author's sympathies lie with the man who oppose the enemies of Modernism.[9] The pseudonymous "Louis Davallon," who contributed the essay "'La sapinière' ou brève histoire de l'organisation intégriste," carried this same tendency to a *reductio ad absurdum*.[10] Directly and indirectly writings of this sort have influenced many of our students to imagine that there was something shameful or highly undesirable about the men who began and who carried on the Catholic polemic against those who taught and who continued to teach the errors condemned by St. Pius X and by his great successor in the See of Peter, Pope Benedict XV. True, the emotionalism and the utter lack of historical judgment manifested in the article by "Davallon" seem to have led some men who previously had formed unfavorable estimates of the integralists to review their position on this subject. But, in a general way, it remains a fact that most of the literature touching upon Modernism and available to our readers tends to depict the Catholic writers who were most prominent in opposing this heresy in a very unpleasant light.

This, for the student of theological history, could turn out to be the most interesting facet of any important contemporary study on the subject of Modernism. It is a phenomenon which only Modernism, among all the heresies that have ever been condemned by the infallible teaching authority of the Catholic Church, has been able to bring about. Precisely because writers sympathetic

[8] Cardinal Suhard's pamphlet considers *"le 'modernisme'"* and *"l'intégrisme"* under the single heading, *"Les options a exclure."* It devotes two pages (34-36) to a discussion of Modernism, without alluding to the fact that this has been condemned in the most severe terms by Popes St. Pius X and Benedict XV. Five and a half pages are given over to a rejection of integralism (36-41). Those attached to what the pamphlet calls *"Intégrisme 'moral'"* are designated either as Quietists or as Jansenists (p. 41).

[9] This book, published in 1950 in Paris by Les Éditions du Cerf, is n. 20 in the series *Unam sanctam*. The section dealing directly with our subject is entitled *"Mentalité 'de droit' et Intégrisme en France"* (pp. 604-22).

[10] The article signed with the pseudonym "Louis Davallon" was printed in the May 15, 1955, issue of *Chronique sociale de France* (pp. 241-61). It is discussed briefly in Fenton, "Some Recent Writings in the Field of Fundamental Dogmatic Theology," in *AER*, CXXXIV, 5 (May, 1956), 340-45.

with the Modernists were able to represent generally the Catholic writers most prominent in contradicting these heretics and in showing up the incompatibility of their teachings with the divine revelation proposed and guarded in the Catholic Church as obnoxious and undesirable characters, Modernism stands forth as one of the most virulent and dangerous heresies ever to have attacked the doctrinal integrity of Our Lord's Mystical Body.

The uniqueness of this achievement and the seriousness of the harm it did to the Church can be appreciated only in the light of the history of heretical assaults against the kingdom of God on earth. From the time of the Gnostics and the Montanists down to the days of the Protestant Reformation, the men who taught and held doctrines opposed to the content of divine public revelation organized themselves into separate groups once their teaching had been condemned and anathematized by the Church's authoritative *magisterium*. The net effect of their activities was that the members of their sects expressed neither the desire to be members of the Catholic Church nor the claim that they were actually associated with this society. The Catholics, on the other hand, were keenly aware that these sects were opposed to the true teachings of divine revelation and were decidedly grateful to the writers and preachers who had exposed and refuted the heretical errors. They were delighted and thankful to have been protected against the poison of doctrinal error.

Indeed, "chasers of heresies" like St. Athanasius, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Leo the Great were among the most prominent of the men raised to the honors of the altar during the earlier days of the Church's history. The Catholic people recognized in the teaching and the conduct of these men, as most powerful and effective expressions of their holiness, that zeal for the purity of the Christian faith which led them into conflict, sometimes bitter and arduous, against the proponents of heretical doctrines.[11]

This state of things persisted during mediaeval times. St. Dominic, the founder of the Order of Friars Preachers, was venerated

[11] On this point it is interesting to note that the Church, in its liturgy, attributes to Our Lady herself the credit for having destroyed all the heresies throughout the entire world. Cf. Fenton, "Our Lady and the Extirpation of Heresy," in *AER*, CXIV, 6 (June, 1946), 442-53.

as a Saint in great measure because of that love of doctrinal orthodoxy which brought him into conflict with the teachings of the Albigensians. And, as a result of their works in favor of the purity of the Catholic faith in controversies against the heresies of the Protestant Reformers, men like St. Peter Canisius and St. Robert Bellarmine were generally recognized as saintly men. Even the Counter-Reformation theologians and controversialists who were not canonized, men like John Eck, James Latomus, William Estius, Francis Suarez, and Francis Sylvius, were honored and revered by Catholics as staunch defenders of Our Lord's teachings.

The tactic of heresy began to change with the advent of Jansenism in the Church. The men who defended the teachings of Jansenius changed the trend of ecclesiastical history when they showed themselves unwilling to set themselves apart from the Church after the teachings they had supported and which they obstinately continued to hold were condemned by competent ecclesiastical authority. They advertised themselves as the true Catholics, as the men who maintained and advanced the genuine teachings of the Church against the efforts of those who were trying to modify Catholic doctrine. And, where previous heretics had vilified the men who had uncovered and refuted their teachings as bad men, the Jansenists attacked their literary opponents as bad Catholics.

The strategy introduced by the Jansenists was adopted and perfected by the Modernists. Masters of the art of publicity, they managed for a time to represent even the saintly and learned Pius X as an incompetent who tended to harm the high position he had been called to occupy, and to insert this fantastically inaccurate judgment even in the most respectable Catholic literature. The most striking result of this tactic is to be seen in the article "Pie X" in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*.[12] And even after the great Pontiff had been beatified, the influential French Catholic magazine *Esprit* expressed the belief that, while he had been a holy

[12] The article, by Father Amann, in *DTC*, XII, 1716-40, actually uses and lists in its bibliography the work of the pseudonymous "Fontaine" (1730). In his summation Father Amann states that "historians need a little more time to decide about his government" (1739), and asks if "certain blows, which had to be energetic, could not have been given *avec un peu de souplesse*" (1740).

man, he was not a success as a Pope.[18] The regular contributor to *Esprit* went so far as to institute a comparison, extremely offensive to the memory of Pius X, between this great Pope and his saintly predecessor, St. Celestine V.

In general, the publicity machine of the Modernists succeeded in bringing into existence an atmosphere in which the out-and-out opponents of the Church and its teaching openly attacked and opposed St. Pius X himself, while less militant sympathizers with the Modernist movement either divided the blame for the "terrible years" between the Pope and those who gave prompt and enthusiastic literary support to his position or reserved their opposition for these "integralist" defenders of the papal teachings. As a result of what the Modernists accomplished in this way, men like Monsignor Benigni and Monsignor Delassus, and Fathers Barbier, Fontaine, and Maignen, men who were competent and devoted enough to detect and to refute the teachings of the Modernists long before the Church's official *magisterium* condemned these heresies, have been depicted in a most unfavorable light in the greater part of the available Catholic literature dealing with Modernism and its consequences. It is obvious and highly unfortunate that this attitude colors and very seriously lessens the value of Monsignor Rivière's otherwise generally able and effective study of this subject.

The molders of public opinion who worked in behalf of Modernism and the Modernists were enabled to achieve this effect by distracting the attention of loyal Catholics from the actual teachings of the Modernists, condemned in the *Lamentabili sane exitu,* in the *Pascendi dominici gregis,* and in the *Sacrorum antistitum.* Like the Jansenists before them, the leaders of the Modernists professed to see in the propositions condemned in these authoritative statements of the Roman See inaccurate renderings of their own teachings. Their partisans, by an unwarranted but still highly effective employment of euphemism, succeeded in making many loyal Catholics imagine that the teachers of Modernism were simply intellectuals

[13] The writing in question is found in a book review, signed only with the initials "H. M.," which appeared in *Esprit,* XIX, 185 (Dec., 1951), 816. The writer was a certain Henri Marrou. Fr. Luc J. Lefèvre called attention to the lack of good taste and of historical competence manifested in that unfortunate book review. Cf. Lefèvre, "Le Bienheureux Pie X et le non-intégriste," in *La pensée catholique,* n. 21 (1952), 1-6.

who were ahead of their times or writers, who, in their enthusiasm for the latest contributions of critical and historical scholarship, were inclined to go a little too far in the use of these contributions in the field of Catholic theology. Again they frequently moved to exculpate the Modernist writers to some extent at least by claiming that, at any rate, these Modernists had raised questions which Catholic theology as such is still trying to answer. The over-all impression they worked to produce was that the Modernists themselves were intellectually brilliant and highly competent scholars, and that the Catholic writers who exposed and refuted them were inferior to them both intellectually and morally.

By far the most effective way to dissipate any misunderstandings along this line is to read the actual texts of the three key pontifical declarations against Modernism. From a didactic point of view, the content of the *Lamentabili sane exitu* is the most valuable. It lists the outstanding errors set forth by men like Loisy, Tyrrell, Von Hügel, Le Roy, and Fonsegrive. The most obvious reaction to the reading of this document by any educated Catholic will be the conviction that the teachings stigmatized by the Holy Office are definitely not mere exaggerations, not assertions by enthusiasts who have "gone too far" in their efforts to incorporate scientific method and content into the field of sacred theology, but blatant and absurd misstatements by men who either did not understand Catholic dogma or had rejected it in its entirety. The *Pascendi dominici gregis,* in the last analysis, simply explains the synthesis from which the errors condemned in the *Lamentabili* have developed. The *Sacrorum antistitum* takes the central teachings brought out in the *Lamentabili* and incorporates them into a profession of the Catholic faith.

The first eight of the sixty-five propositions condemned in the *Lamentabili* refer to the Church's *magisterium,* in itself and in its authority to interpret the meaning of the Sacred Scriptures. One of these is an assertion that the Church's *magisterium* cannot determine the true meaning of the Sacred Scriptures even in dogmatic definitions.[14] Another is the claim that the Church, when it pro-

[14] The propositions condemned in the *Lamentabili* are listed in Denzinger's *Enchiridion symbolorum,* nn. 2001-65. The proposition here mentioned is n. 2004.

scribes errors, cannot exact from the faithful any internal assent by which its decisions are to be received.[15]

The next eleven have to do with the inspiration and the truth of the Bible. One of these claims that people who believe that God is really the Author of Sacred Scripture show themselves to be either over-simple or ignorant.[16] Another says that the accounts given St. John in the course of the Fourth Gospel are not properly history at all, but rather a "mystical contemplation of the Gospel." It adds that the sermons attributed to Our Lord in that Gospel are theological meditations about the mystery of salvation, devoid of any historical truth.[17]

The next seven among the condemned propositions are clear contradictions of the teachings set forth by the Vatican Council in its constitution *Dei Filius*. The next nine deny any objective significance to Catholic belief in Our Lord's divinity and His Messianic dignity. They include the statement that the doctrine about Our Lord taught by Saints Paul and John, and by the Councils of Nicea, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, is not what Our Lord Himself taught, but what Christian consciousness thought up about Him.[18] The next three deny the historical reality of Our Lord's resurrection from the dead and claim that the teaching about Our Lord's sacrificial death comes only from St. Paul, and not from the Gospels themselves. The following thirteen propositions contradict the teaching of the Church on the subject of the sacraments in general and on each of the seven sacraments individually. Six subsequent propositions attack the Catholic dogmas on the origin, the constitution, and the teaching activity of the true Church of the New Testament. The last eight among the condemned theses teach that Catholic dogma has changed, and that what the Church has proposed as divine revelation at one period of its life is something quite different from what it has proposed as divinely revealed at other times.

An educated and loyal Catholic who reads the texts of the *Lamentabili sane exitu*, the *Pascendi dominici gregis*, and the *Sacrorum antistitum* today cannot help but be astonished that people who claimed to be loyal Catholics could ever have been disturbed, troubled, or frightened at the appearance of these documents fifty

[15] Cf. *Denz.*, 2007.
[16] Cf. *Denz.*, 2009.
[17] Cf. *Denz.*, 2016.
[18] Cf. *Denz.*, 2031.

years ago. The propositions they condemned were blatant denials of the message which the Church has always taught and will always continue to teach as God's own public and supernatural revelation. Objectively, the painful and disturbing thing was that such propositions were being taught and held, within the Catholic Church itself, by men who were members of the Church. The firm and unequivocal condemnation of these propositions by the saintly Pius X was in itself, and certainly should have been recognized as, an unalloyed benefit to the Church and the people of God.

In the light of history, it should be quite apparent that the greatest damage inflicted by Modernism on the cause of Jesus Christ came after, rather than before, the issuance of the *Lamentabili* and the *Pascendi*. Before these documents were promulgated, the teachers of false doctrine within the Church could at least allege the excuse that their theses had not as yet been distinctly reproved by the See of Peter. Once the *Lamentabili* had appeared, even this excuse was taken from them. And, it is a matter of historical record that, as a group, the leaders and organizers of the Modernist movement made no move whatsoever sincerely and effectively to retract the doctrines which had been condemned by the Holy See. Indeed, Von Hügel, the outstanding leader and the most shamelessly insolent among the Modernists, used the appearance of the *Lamentabili* as an occasion to summon what proved to be the comically impotent *conciliabulum* of Modernists at Molveno.[19]

Many of these individuals left the Church and remained outside of it. Others (and these were more numerous and dangerous) continued to live as Catholics, and made little effort to hide the fact that they considered the papal judgments against their teachings ill-advised and inaccurate. In no case is there any record of a really prominent Modernist who gratefully and sincerely accepted the teachings of the Holy See against Modernism for what they really were, the authoritative and beneficent pronouncements of divinely revealed truth.

[19] Cf. De la Bedoyere, *op. cit.*, pp. 196 ff. and Rivière, *op. cit.*, pp. 453 ff. Rivière incorporates into his own narrative about the Molveno fiasco (p. 454) the following citation from Sabatier: "The priest who, in a voice hushed by emotion, told me about that scene [Von Hügel's final speech at Molveno] added that all of those present had thought of St. Paul's farewell to the elders of the Church of Ephesus."

The Modernists themselves, however, were not by any means the main cause of the evils that afflicted the Church after the famous pronouncements of 1907. The principal responsibility for the weakening of the Catholic faith and the confusion about Catholic doctrine that harmed so much Catholic writing and affected so many individuals after the issuance of the *Lamentabili sane exitu* is rather that of sympathizers with Modernism. These people were not themselves guilty of openly teaching the propositions condemned by the Holy See in *Lamentabili* and in the other authoritative documents. Indeed, some of them seem to have tried to restrain their Modernist friends from giving public utterance to such teachings.

Yet, by reason of personal friendship of family association, or even of misguided institutional loyalty, these sympathizers with Modernism and the Modernists worked indefatigably to turn Catholic opinion against the men who had been most zealous in exposing the original Modernist heresies and who still continued to oppose any teaching within the Church which directly or by clear and certain implication ran counter to Catholic orthodoxy. It was the Modernist sympathizers, rather than the Modernists themselves, who were responsible for the campaign of vilification which was, and which still continues to be, waged against the priests who worked together or who worked as separate individuals to advance the teaching of St. Pius X and to oppose all tentatives within the Church to contradict his teaching or to frustrate his directions. Thus, for example, the calumnies that were levelled against Monsignor Benigni during his lifetime, and which still continue to assail his memory, were concocted and spread abroad, not so much by the Modernists themselves as by sympathizers with Modernism.

Directly or indirectly, the attitudes of the sympathizers with Modernism have entered into and colored most of the literature about Modernism currently available to our American Catholic readers. As a result of this condition our people, even after the glorious canonization of St. Pius X (an event that was in itself providential), have not been put in a position in which they are able to see and adequately to appreciate the great work he did for Our Lord and for His Church by condemning this most dangerous of doctrinal aberrations and by moving powerfully to defend the faithful from being infected by it. This condition can and should be remedied, to some extent at least, during this anniversary year.

If it is to be remedied, the scholars who study the doctrines and the history of Modernism will have to take a step which their predecessors have, for one reason or another, failed to take. They will have to study the history of Modernism, not only through the pronouncements of the Holy See and through the writings of the Modernists and their sympathizers, but also in the books and articles of the "integralists" themselves. They will need to read and to ponder the writings of men like Fr. Emmanuel Barbier, men who paid dearly in their lifetime for the privilege of defending the teachings and the directives of St. Pius X. And, when they have completed this study, they will inevitably find that these men, dismissed without a hearing in books like *Insurrection versus Resurrection,* were far better theologians, better historians, and better writers than the people who have calumniated them.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

THE USE OF ANAPHRODISIACS

Question: Is a person guilty of sin if he takes drugs to render himself less inclined to sexual gratification?

Answer: If the drugs in question, known as anaphrodisiacs, produce their effect by impairing the person's sexual *power* of coition or of procreation, so that he is rendered (even temporarily) impotent or sterile, he commits a sin by taking the drugs. For, in that event he would perform an action directly tending to produce impotence or sterility, an act forbidden by the divine law. But if the direct effect of the drugs is merely to lessen the person's sexual inclinations, a further distinction is needed. If the person is married and the use of these drugs would deprive his partner of the full ardor of conjugal intercourse, it would ordinarily be a sin of injustice to use them. I say "ordinarily," because it would seem that the use of anaphrodisiacs could be permitted to a married person, even though the partner's enjoyment of conjugal relations were thereby somewhat diminished, if the individual in question were using them for a very good reason, such as help to overcome the habit of masturbation. In that event the diminution of the partner's rights could be permitted on the principle of the double effect. Finally, if a person is unmarried, or, though married, is in a situation where he cannot have conjugal relations (for example, far distant from his partner) there seems to be no objection to the use of anaphrodisiacs (that directly diminish the sexual urge) to assist him in observing continence. For, in such a case, he is simply making use of a natural means to quell an unruly appetite, just as a person takes a drug to curb his appetite for food when dieting is beneficial for his health. Let me add that I am not concerned with the medical problem as to what drugs (if any) are capable of dulling the sexual inclinations. I believe that many unfounded notions on this matter are popularly accepted. I am concerned only with the moral aspect of such drugs if they actually possess the effect ascribed to them.

EVENING MASS FOR FORTY HOURS' DEVOTION

Question: Is it in accordance with the Constitution *Christus Dominus* for a Bishop to permit an evening Mass for the conclusion of the Forty Hours' Devotion?

Answer: The Instruction of the Holy Office which was published with the *Christus Dominus,* to interpret its provisions, gives as one of the occasions when an evening Mass may be permitted by the Bishop "solemnities which are celebrated with a great concourse of people" (n. 12, d). Surely, this seems applicable to the conclusion of the Forty Hours' Devotion in the average American parish, since the faithful come in great numbers to this ceremony. It is true, on March 22, 1955, the Holy Office issued a warning, emphasizing that evening Masses may be celebrated only when they promote the "common good of the faithful" and forbidding such Masses merely for the promotion of external solemnity or for the benefit of private individuals—*ad externam dumtaxat solemnitatem decorandam aut in privatorum commodum* (*AAS,* XLVII [1955], 218). But beyond doubt an evening Mass for the close of the Forty Hours' Devotion enables many persons to receive Holy Communion who could not be present at a morning Mass, and from that standpoint it is surely directed to the common good of the faithful, not merely to the promotion of external solemnity or to the benefit of private individuals.

THE PRECIOUS FIVE-DOLLAR BILL

Question: A clerk stole a five-dollar bill from the desk of his wealthy employer and spent it. Afterward he discovered that the bill was a rare collector's item, worth more than a thousand dollars. What was the gravity of the clerk's sin of theft, and what is to be said of his obligation to make restitution?

Answer: Objectively the clerk committed a grave sin, since a thousand dollars greatly exceeds the absolute sum for serious matter, however rich his employer may be. If he was in invincible ignorance of the extraordinary value of this particular piece of currency and believed he was committing a sin of injustice only

to the extent of five dollars, the theft was subjectively venial, since the employer is described as a wealthy man. If, when he discovers the special value of the bill there is no longer any reasonable hope of recovering it, he satisfies his obligation of restitution (binding *sub levi*) by restoring five dollars to his employer, since he disposed of the money in good faith, as regards its special worth, and has become no richer from this standpoint. However, if there is a chance that he can get back the original five-dollar bill (for example, from the store where he spent it shortly before he found out its great value) he is bound to make this effort; and this obligation binds *sub gravi,* and according to the common teaching as a duty of *justice.* Hence, if he neglects to make this attempt when the recovery of the bill could be hoped for, and later it becomes impossible to locate it, he would be bound to restore the full value of the currency—that is, a thousand dollars, or at least an amount proportionate to the hope he had of recovering the bill. However, there would be no obligation to make a search or later to make full restitution if the attempt to find the money would be likely to be gravely detrimental to him (for example, if it might lead to a lengthy prison term). On the other hand, if the employer finds out that the clerk was the thief, he could lawfully bring suit against him for the entire amount, even though the clerk disposed of the money in good faith as regards its special value and could not later recover it. And, if the verdict of the court requires restitution of the full value of the bill, the thief would be bound in conscience to pay it.

RELICS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN

Question: I was asked recently by a parishioner to explain the fact that in certain parts of Europe veneration is given to what are claimed to be relics of the Blessed Virgin Mary. How can this be reconciled with the doctrine of faith that the body of Our Lady is now in heaven?

Answer: None of these relics are proposed for veneration as portions of Our Lady's body. They are said to be portions of her garments, her ring, etc.—second class relics as we call them. Hence, they offer no objection to the doctrine of Mary's bodily

Assumption. It would be well to tell our people, when they ask such questions, that the Church does not attest the genuineness of such relics, although they may be venerated on the ground that there is some probability that they are actually relics of the Mother of God.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

DISTRIBUTION OF HOLY COMMUNION

Question: In distributing Holy Communion to a large number of the laity is it necessary to recite the complete formula for each communicant? I know some priests that recite it once for every two or three communicants.

Answer: The various rubricists direct that the entire form be recited for each person receiving Holy Communion. *The Book of Ceremonies* (O'Connell-Schmitz) states in a footnote on p. 112 that "all authors agree upon this."

TABERNACLE DOOR AT HOLY COMMUNION TIME

Question: At our parish there is no uniformity about closing and keeping open the tabernacle door at the time Holy Communion is distributed. Just what is the correct practice?

Answer: Father J. O'Connell (*The Celebration of Mass*) directs that the tabernacle door be closed once the ciborium has been removed from the tabernacle, provided, however, that the tabernacle is not empty. In that event, the tabernacle is to be kept opened. *The Book of Ceremonies* (O'Connell-Schmitz) implies that the tabernacle door remains open during the distribution of Holy Communion, regardless of other sacred vessels being in the tabernacle. Mueller-Ellis in their handbook of ceremonies state that the tabernacle remains open. *Sacred Ceremonies of the Low Mass* by O'Callaghan and the *Rubrics of the Low Mass* by Donoghue direct the priest to close the tabernacle door after the

ciborium has been placed on the corporal. Thus it seems we are correct, regardless of what practice we follow.

MASTER OF CEREMONIES AT HIGH MASS

Question: The ceremony books I have consulted all state that the master of ceremonies in a Solemn High Mass at the words, "per quem omnia haec," just before the *Pater Noster* ascends the platform to minister to the Missal. Now I have been told that I am training my altar boys incorrectly and that the MC may do that only if he is an ordained cleric or has received Tonsure. I am of the opinion that anyone who is acting as MC may do all that is directed for that particular office.

Answer: In all the books and authors consulted we have not found anything to direct the master of ceremonies of the Mass to change his regular course of action due to the fact that he is not a tonsured cleric. If such were the case, many alterations in ceremonies would have to be made for Solemn High Masses in the United States.

VESTMENT MATERIAL

Question: What are the regulations about materials required for vestments, like the chasuble and stole?

Answer: The Sacred Congregation has prescribed silk materials for the chasuble, maniple and stole. Msgr. Collins states that "fabrics, silk at least in greater part are permitted, such as satin, silk poplin, silk velvet. Silk fabrics, mixed with some other materials, such as wool, cotton or linen, may be tolerated. Fabrics of pure wool, linen, cotton or spun glass are explicitly forbidden. Cloth of real silver or white silk interwoven with silver thread is permitted, but it must be cloth which has been woven of real gold threads or from material which is in greater part of real gold or at least silver-gilt." This statement based on various decisions of the Congregation of Sacred Rites certainly seems to rule out the use of nylon or plastics for ecclesiastical vestments.

BREVIARY PROBLEM

Question: What lesson should we use for a former semi-double feast now reduced to a simple office? Should we combine lessons four, five and six?

Answer: This has occurred frequently enough since the various changes have taken place in the breviary. At the end of the second nocturn, in most breviaries, we find lessons four, five and six reduced or combined in one lesson. That becomes the third lesson for the simple office of a saint. Should these combined lessons not appear in the breviary, we must take the third lesson from the second nocturn and combine lessons four, five and six without their responses.

OMITTING LEONINE PRAYERS

Question: Is it permissible to omit the Leonine prayers after a parochial Mass, when it is a low Mass?

Answer: We presume that our inquirer means a Sunday parish Mass when he is referring to a parochial Mass. We are permitted to omit these prayers after a Mass celebrated with some external solemnity, as First Holy Communion Sunday or a General Communion Sunday. Or again we may omit them when the Mass is followed immediately by some other function or pious exercise, as Exposition or Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Normally, we are not to omit the Leonine Prayers after a parochial Mass, even though it is permitted to do so after a conventual Mass.

MINOR BASILICA

Question: Recently a parish church in our diocese has been designated a minor basilica. Precisely what makes this church different from other parish churches?

Answer: Some years ago the following article appeared in the Baltimore diocesan paper (*Baltimore Review*) relative to their cathedral church being a minor basilica. "The privileges of a minor

basilica comprise the right of precedence and the use of the pavilion and bell. Also a coat-of-arms and a corporate seal may be used.

"The use of the pavilion (conopaeum) is the second privilege of a minor basilica. The article is so constructed that it cannot be fully spread, but remains half open. It is made up of red and yellow silk in twelve alternate strips, six yellow and six read with contrasting pendants which are braided and fringed in yellow. The handle is an ordinary banner pole. The whole structure is topped with a ball surmounted by a cross, both of gilt metal.

"The precise origin of this umbrella is not known. It is probable that it is derived from a large umbrella or parasol which in ancient times was kept at the various Roman basilicas to be held over the head of the Roman Pontiff whenever he visited the basilica to officiate or attend services. In the course of time the Popes gradually ceased to make actual use of the pavilion; but the basilical clergy continued to have one ready in case the Pope should ever have to use it.

"Likewise the origin of the bell is not clear. Probably it was used to signal the clergy when to start the procession to meet the Pope at the door of the basilica. It is like other bells, but is small being not more than six inches in diameter at the bottom. It is mounted in an elaborate framework of metal and/or gilt wood fixed to the top of a banner pole, a sort of portable belfry.

"Both the pavilion and the bell are borne in every procession inside or outside the basilica, except for those processions of a funeral nature. They are borne after the processional cross, the pavilion following the bell."

ALTAR BOY PROBLEMS

Question: (a) At the offertory should the servers kiss the cruets before handing the wine and water to the celebrant? Is there any justification in the apparently widespread custom of not doing so? (b) At the *Orate Fratres,* is there any longer a reason for the servers bowing low as they recite the *Suscipiat?* Should they not remain kneeling erect, and if so, at what place—in the center of the altar or at their usual places? (c) These servers have been

remaining in their usual places during the consecration and elevation. Is there any justification in the servers not going to the center, and holding the chasuble of the celebrant as he elevates the Host and the Chalice, as they kneel on the top step? Don't the rubrics prescribe this latter course of action? Or is there some excuse for not observing this?

Answer: (a) O'Connell, Lane and Britt, all excellent authorities on these particular problems, direct that the altar boy kiss the cruets when presenting them to the celebrant and when receiving them back. However, in a requiem Mass these kisses are omitted. We see no justification for ignoring these directions.
(b) The same three rubricists direct that the server recite the *Suscipiat* without bowing, but kneeling and from his place at the epistle side of the altar. (c) According to these rubricists the server kneels on the predella toward the center and raises slightly the chasuble of the celebrant as he elevates both the Host and the Chalice.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Analecta

The closing days of the month of October were grim ones for the world and the Church with the Polish, Hungarian, and Middle Eastern crises. Three times in a period of two weeks the Holy Father issued special encyclicals with appeals to the world for prayers. In the first encyclical, *Luctuosissimi eventus,* on October 28, the Pope pleaded for prayers for peace based on justice for the peoples of eastern Europe, especially those in Hungary. "Order," he said, "cannot be restored among the sundered peoples by force of arms, which brings death to men. Nor can it be restored by violence inflicted on citizens . . . or by false theories which corrupt the mind. . . . The aspiration for real liberty can never be suffocated with external force." He concluded with the hope that a crusade of prayer by the peoples of the world would be aided by the intercession of the Virgin Mary and move the Lord to avert the dangers of war, bring peace to nations, and protection to the sacred rights of the Church to which "the great human family, rent asunder by sin" should submit.

A second encyclical followed on November 8. This encyclical, *Laetamur admodum,* pleaded again for prayers from the nations of the world for peace, and especially for a peaceful solution of the Middle East situation. "Our hope," he said, "rests solely with Him who, with His heavenly light, can illumine the minds of men and bend their . . . wills to more moderate counsels in order that right order may be established between nations."

The Holy Father sent a telegram to Cardinal Mindszenty on November 2 and expressed his joy at the release of the Cardinal. He imparted his apostolic blessing to the Cardinal, to the other Hungarian shepherds, clergy, and faithful, and in a special way, to those who were stricken by the calamities in Hungary.

Events moved rapidly and tragically for the Hungarians and the Holy Father issued another encyclical, *Datis nuperrime,* on November 6. In this encyclical the Holy Father condemned the Soviet use of force to re-impose its control on Hungary and called anew for prayers for peace. The Pope said that "every violence, every unjust spilling of blood . . . is always illicit." He then

announced that he was offering prayers for those who had been killed in Hungary and added: "We desire also that all Christians join their prayers to Ours for this purpose." Although the name of the Soviets was not specifically mentioned, the Pope lamented the sad deeds in Hungary which have provoked "the bitter sorrow and indignation not only of the Catholic world, but also of all free people." He declared that a people's desire for freedom cannot be "smothered in blood." He then warned the Russians that God, who "often punishes the sins of private individuals only after death, sometimes, as history teaches, also strikes in this life at governors and nations . . . for their injustice." The Pope concluded with the hope that God will "touch the heart of those responsible in such a way that injustice would at last be ended, all violence would cease and all nations, brought to peace among themselves, would again find right order in an atmosphere of serene tranquillity."

In an address during an audience in which he received the Spanish Foreign Minister and his staff on November 6, the Holy Father spoke of the current world situation. He observed that there are generally several alternatives in the solution of world problems when human forces that can be controlled are at work, but in the present crisis, the world is confronted with one of the most serious. "One can foresee," he declared, "no other solution but to appeal to the eternal principles of brotherhood and justice, moderation and prudence, to awareness of individual responsibility, to the exact and calm evaluation of means and ends, and to a constant recollection of the account that each one of us must render before the judgment seat of God and of history."

Despite his concern and preoccupation with the world crises and the tragic conditions in Hungary, the Holy Father found time for a lengthy address on the dignity of womanhood and for another concerning the family. In a radio address to a convention of the Federation of Italian Women at Loreto on October 16, the Pope lamented the degradation and contempt towards womanhood on the part of a pagan world. False theories, frivolous customs, and perverse associations, he said, are turning women from their duties and defeating their God-given dignity under the deceptive appearance of the exaltation of womanhood. "Oh how we wish that . . . all the women of the world would gather around the

throne of the Virgin to learn from her example the secret of every greatness and how to fulfill in themselves the divine designs." Woman's divinely given dignity should be the basic idea of the Catholic woman's movement, the Pope said. Like man, he continued, she is a child of God, redeemed by Christ, and both have the same supernatural destiny as well as a common earthly one. Although women are not barred from any human activities, he pointed to woman's nature and her spiritual qualities, and observed that all conspire to make woman a *mother* which is her primary function. Her force for good in the world, he said, is not to be found in joining ranks with the laborers in shipyards and mines, but rather in the good example which she gives. In conclusion, he urged women to practice the teachings of the Church with regard to the position and dignity of woman, and to be faithful to their work, to the Pope, to society, and to the nation.

Addressing an audience of *Catholic Families of Austria* on October 16, the Pope lamented the fact that the family as a social unit is undergoing a crisis in the modern world. An incalculable number of sins are being committed against it, he said, particularly through man's unbridled desire to procure at all times an easier existence for himself, through the movie industry, and finally, through laicist, or even atheistic, education in schools. Catholics must work, he said, so that public morals and the law of the state may concede freedom to the institutions of marriage and the family, to education and schools, according to Catholic norms.

During the month of October and the early part of November, the Holy Father also delivered various short addresses on the occasion of audiences to particular groups. Thus members of the Committee for Public Health of the Union for Western Europe had an audience with the Pope on October 19 and heard him describe the improvement of people's health as one of the most important factors in raising their standard of living. Improvement in health standards brought about by governments of the world, he said, are steps that lead to greater international concord and harmony. Speaking to delegates of an international conference on drugs and pharmaceutical products on October 23, the Holy Father touched upon the subject again and pointed to the duty of the drug and pharmaceutical industries to help overcome public health problems.

On October 27 the Holy Father called upon the middle class of society to exercise their duty in behalf of the "moral health" of society at the same time as they strive for economic and political stability. The occasion was an address to the International Institute of the Middle Classes. He also declared that a happy social order finds its strongest basis in a moral order founded on justice and charity as exemplified in the life and teachings of Christ.

In an audience granted to the people of Prato, Italy, under the leadership of their bishop, the Holy Father warned that "there will be no justice in places of employment where Christ does not reign as king." He reminded employers that the Church recognizes the right of property but not an unlimited and absolute right involving no obligations of justice and charity. On the other hand, he said, the Church is in agreement with the workers when they seek protection from unjust contracts, and when they desire the observance of just promises, or the betterment of their position through lawful means. "But the Church cannot be with you," he warned the workers, "if you side with the enemies of God . . ."

Again the Holy Father had words of warning against overemphasis of the material in regard to true values. Twice in a week, once to automobile designers and on another occasion to textile workers, the Holy Father spoke words which emphasized the need for attention to spiritual matters on the part of man.

In an address to seminarians and young priests of the German Hungarian College, the Holy Father exhorted them that they should never allow secondary goals to stand in the way of their main aim, to serve Christ through His Church and "her great mission." Their priesthood, he said, should be characterized by: ". . . unconditional faithfulness to the service of the Divine Majesty; love for Christ, a love strong enough to make you accept sacrifices; pledging yourselves to the Church of Jesus Christ and her great mission; no mean avasions toward secondary concerns, but always aiming at essential ones, keeping in mind the important fact that men recognize God, and live, grow and move in His Grace."

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.Carm.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

THE TWO-EDGED SWORD. By John L. McKenzie, S.J. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1956. Pp. xi + 336. $4.50.

If there are any unconscious Marcionists among us, they would do nothing better than read this book which is sub-titled, "An interpretation of the Old Testament." There is nothing in English, or in any other language, I would say, comparable to it, with its broad but sure survey of Old Testament beliefs, the acute observations of the author, the combination of the scholar's knowledge with an excellent English style and stimulating presentation. This interpretation has been made possible only by tremendous strides in our knowledge of ancient Near Eastern archeology and literature, and one of the particular values of Father McKenzie's approach is that he has situated Israel in her historical background and highlighted her transcendence as well as her debt to the ancient world.

The author begins with basic notions about the bible and interpretation, revelation, and the religious background of the ancient world. Two chapters treat of the origins of the world and of man (here McKenzie emphasizes the anti-Canaanite cast of the first chapters of Genesis.) Five chapters deal with the key developments in the life of Israel: the exodus and covenant, royalty, prophets and international relations, and messianism. Four more units are given over to the wisdom literature of the Hebrews, the problems of evil and the afterlife, and the Psalms. Two chapters conclude the work: the God of the Hebrews and the relationship between the Old and the New Testament.

Perhaps the most adequate way of reviewing a book with whose conclusions one agrees, is to state why everyone else should read it:

(1) This is a full and satisfying statement of the literal sense of the Old Testament, i.e. what God wanted to be conveyed to the people for whom this literature was composed. The fact is that the exposition of its beliefs is in itself a good apologetic for the Old Testament.

(2) There is a profound insight into the institutions, culture and religion of the Hebrews. One thinks particularly of the evaluation of the prophets (pp. 150-88), or the messianic hope (pp. 189-210). Although this book is written for the general reader, it rightly presupposes that the reader will think and react, that he will want to integrate the Old Testament with the modern point of view. Hence the author frequently and effectively tempers the judgment which a modern

reader might be inclined to pass on the *prima facie* imperfections of the Old Testament revelation.

(3) There is no shirking of Old Testament "problems." One might mention the treatment of the imprecatory psalms (pp. 281-85), of the afterlife (pp. 246-64) (this "reconstruction" of Hebrew ideas of the afterlife might have allowed for actual existence, however shadowy, in the nether world). One aspect of Old Testament literature which is perhaps most misunderstood today is history. In line with the directives of *Divino afflante Spiritu,* Father McKenzie has given several pages to an excellent analysis of the literary forms of history in the Old Testament (pp. 60-71).

(4) Finally, the book is exceedingly well-written. In the Bruce *News* Father McKenzie states that he revised the whole four times and some sections as many as eight times. The result is that we have distinguished prose and clear thinking. The author modestly writes that his work could be only a beginning of a spiritual interpretation of the Old Testament. But it is far more than this; for the general reader it is the best study of the Old Testament that exists. The readers of *AER,* particularly priests and seminarians who may have puzzled over Old Testament attitudes, will want to read and re-read this extraordinary book.

ROLAND E. MURPHY, O.Carm.

THE BRIDGE. A Yearbook of Judaeo-Christian Studies. Vol. II. Edited by John M. Oesterreicher. New York: Pantheon Books, 1956. Pp. 357. $3.95.

This second issue of *The Bridge* contains twelve articles and four book reviews. Two of the articles, "The Word is a Seed," by Fr. Alexander Jones, and "The Community of Qumran," by Fr. John Oesterreicher, are extraordinarily good. Father Jones has explained the use of the Hebrew word "Memra" in the Old Testament and in the Targumic literature in such a way as to show how this term, translated accurately though not in a completely adequate manner by the Greek "Logos," was ready for understandable use in the Gospel according to St. John. His article is a genuine and valuable contribution to the science of sacred theology. Father Oesterreicher's contribution gives additional insight into the significance of the recently discovered manuscripts about the Qumran organization. He has made a definitely worth-while addition to the readily available information on this vitally interesting subject.

The editor of *The Bridge* has been less felicitous in his introduction to the present volume, a two-page preface which he has entitled "A Word of Thanks." According to Father Oesterreicher: "When we call them [the Jews] 'our separated brethren,' we seek to express the authentic mind of the Church, for in *Mystici Corporis,* Pius XII pleads that genuine love for the Church must know no limits or borders. Not only her members, he says, but also those who are not yet one with us in Christ's Mystical Body, must we 'recognize as brothers of Christ according to the flesh, destined together with us to eternal salvation.' This being true of all the sons of Adam, it is most certainly true of the sons of Abraham, 'the father of our faith.' "

What the Holy Father actually said about the unrestricted love of the Church was this: "Therefore the true love of the Church demands, not only that we should be members of one another in the same body, solicitous for each other, that we ought to be members who rejoice when another member is uplifted and who suffer with him when he is in suffering, but also that we should acknowledge other men, not yet joined with us in the Church's Body, as brothers of Christ according to the flesh, called together with us to the same eternal salvation."

The encyclical did not describe members and non-members of the Church indiscriminately as "*destined* together with us to eternal salvation." Rather, it spoke of non-members of the Church as *summoned* or *called* together with us to the same eternal salvation. There is a world of difference between the two formulae.

Furthermore, the encyclical did not state that we are to regard both members and non-members of the Church as being in the same position either as persons loved in a charitable love for the Church or in the plan of God's salvation. Father Oesterreicher describes the Holy Father as urging us to recognize both members and non-members of the Church "as brothers of Christ according to the flesh, destined together with us to eternal salvation." The *Mystici Corporis,* on the contrary, teaches that a genuine love for the Church of Jesus Christ demands a special and intimate mutual affection among the members of the Church who recognize one another as parts of the same Mystical Body. True, it also insists upon a realization of the fact that non-members of the Church are actually Our Lord's brothers according to the flesh, and of the fact that they are summoned or invited by God Himself to the eternal salvation which can only be obtained in the true Church. The love of charity is essentially all-inclusive. It is incompatible with any restriction. But, by the same token, it also demands the order of charity. And, in the passage of the *Mystici Corporis* to which Father Oesterreicher alludes, the Holy Father has made it perfectly clear that our fellow members of the Church are closer to us in the

order of charity than those people who have not as yet obtained membership in Our Lord's Mystical Body.

The encyclical describes this special and strong affection of charity which the members of the Church are meant to have for one another by using the Pauline metaphor about the members of a living physical body. In our love for God and His Church, we are called upon to rejoice with a fellow Catholic when he has reason to be glad, and to sorrow with him when he is in pain or in trouble. For there is a brotherhood in terms of the true Church itself, a supernatural brotherhood with Our Lord and with each other which is supernatural, distinct from and indescribably superior to any brotherhood according to the flesh. It is the brotherhood which carries with it the dignity of adoptive sonship of God. It is the brotherhood which men attain in, and only in the Catholic Church, the Mystical Body of the Son of God.

When the *Mystici Corporis* speaks of non-members of the Church as being "called together with us to the same eternal salvation," it alludes to the fact that God wills that all men should attain to the supernatural and eternal glory of the Beatific Vision, which has been made obtainable to us through Our Lord's Passion and death. As a result, He invites all men to this eternal beatitude and to the things necessary for its attainment both through the inward suggestion of His graces and by the voice of His Son's Mystical Body. The love of the Church which is ordered and which extends to all men inevitably carries with it a desire of and a prayer for the salvation of all those whom God has called. No one can love the Church of Christ unless he seriously wants to see God's will accomplished and His invitation answered.

The member of the Church answers God's call or invitation by advancing and persevering in the life of grace which he has derived from God through Baptism, the Eucharist, and the other sacraments, and by regaining that life, if he has been guilty of mortal sin after his reception of Baptism, through the sacrament of Penance. The baptized non-Catholic must remove whatever *obex* to his baptismal character has prevented that character from incorporating him into Our Lord's Mystical Body if he is to accept God's invitation. And the unbaptized man, whatever his racial origin may be, receives that call in the words which St. Peter addressed to his hearers on the first Christian Pentecost: "Do penance and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins. And you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost . . . Save yourselves from this perverse generation."

Thus, our love for all men which is involved in our affection of charity for the true Church necessarily demands that we will for all

men, and pray that they receive, not only the Beatific Vision itself, but also the various benefits requisite for its attainment. We pray and strive that our fellow members of the Mystical Body may grow and persevere in grace, and that, if they have cast away the life of grace through mortal sin, they may regain it in the Sacrament of Penance. And, by the force of that same charity, we should work and strive that non-members of the Church may enter it, and then utilize and enjoy the supernatural benefits available within it. If we do not thus work and pray in their behalf, our charity does not extend to them.

Now it is precisely on this point that, to the mind of this reviewer, *The Bridge* seems somewhat remiss. Its emphasis seems always on points of similarity between Judaism and Catholicism. It contains frequent and emphatic mention of injustices Jews have received at the hands of Christians, and, in general, speaks in such a way as to make the reader imagine that, after all, the Jew of New Testament times is in a fair position spiritually despite his rejection of and opposition to Our Divine Lord. It tends to cover up the need for repentance and Baptism, a need as urgent upon the Jew as it is upon any other man who has not as yet been incorporated into the Church by the sacrament of faith. And it also tends to obscure a truth brought out with marvellous clarity in the Epistle to the Galatians:

> For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ.
>
> There is neither Jew nor Greek: there is neither bond nor free: there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus.
>
> And if you be Christ's, then are you the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise (3:26-29).

In Father Journet's "The Mysterious Destinies of Israel," the longest and by far the least satisfactory contribution to this volume of *The Bridge,* these tendencies are most clearly manifest. In this article the rejection of Our Lord and opposition to Him are certainly not depicted as faults which the individual Jew should repent. He describes the repudiation of the Saviour as "A crime of clerical misfeasance, unequalled prototype of all similar crimes," and as "this dreadful error" (p. 61). He holds that "The decision of Israel's leaders did indeed bequeath to future generations enormous obstacles to the recognition of the Messiah. But for the greatest number of souls, these obstacles may well amount to invincible ignorance" (p. 62). And, he tells us: "In the very bosom, then, of the Israel of the flesh, all who are interiorly attentive to the invitations of grace are, in obscurity and silence, led toward the Israel of the spirit, indeed are already of it" (p. 68).